

A GREAT CARDINAL¹

IF the condition of true greatness may be said to be the possession of great gifts and their unflinchingly courageous use in the pursuit of a noble end, then certainly Henry Edward Manning deserves to be called and remembered as a great prelate. Of his outstanding gifts in the order alike of nature and of grace there can be no manner of doubt. To the dauntless use which he made of them in spite of manifold obstacles and of opposition from many sides, almost every page of Mr. Shane Leslie's newly published biography bears witness. And of the sublime worthiness of the end which throughout his life as a Catholic priest, Archbishop, and Cardinal, he unswervingly pursued, it is enough to observe that it was the end which the Incarnate Word set before Himself and all of us,—the salvation and sanctification of souls. To say that Manning had his human weaknesses and his human limitations is only to say that he was a man, not an angel. And whereas it betrays a certain mental and moral meanness to rejoice over the shortcomings of greater men, as though by reducing them to our own level we could lift ourselves to theirs, it is instructive and in the best sense edifying to watch—when this is possible—the efforts of any man, be his gifts great or small, to detect his own failings and to gain that victory over them which is in the sight of God so much more glorious than any sort of outward success.

It has been well said that the most important part of history is that which by the very nature of things can never be committed to paper or print, being that which consists in the interior working of divine grace, or in the interior resistance to divine grace, in the souls of men. And the same is of course no less true of biography. Nevertheless, though this inner history or biography can never be fully written, the historian and the biographer may have the good fortune to catch many a glimpse of the secret inner life, whether like Janssen, of a whole people or, where the subject of a bio-

¹ *Henry Edward Manning, His Life and Labours.* By Shane Leslie, M.A. Burns, Oates and Washbourne, Ltd. Price, 25s.

graphy has left documents intended for no eye but his own, of an individual. And it is for this reason that I venture to regard as the most important and enlightening pages in Mr. Shane Leslie's *Life of Cardinal Manning* the hitherto unpublished Notes of the retreat which he made on his appointment as Archbishop of Westminster. For it is these, more than anything else in the book, which give us the key which opens the door to a right understanding of his unwearied and manifold activity, and in particular of his conduct in the numerous conflicts with which he found himself embroiled, and which he carried through with a pertinacity so indomitable.

From the outset of his retreat he has the deep conviction that he is called to do our Lord's work in our Lord's way, the way of suffering and the cross; "the *Volto Sagro* . . . the sacred countenance wounded and darkened by sorrow and suffering" is to be the exemplar with which his own soul's portraiture is to be brought into conformity. He is alive to the prospect not only of trials from without, but of inward "temptations, illusions and sins." "Every day for the last twenty years I have prayed God to deliver me from the blood of souls." His method of prayer is chiefly that of "talking to our Lord of what I am doing or suffering or intending or fearing." This he very humbly feels "to be a low state, yet it is a safe one, I trust." He fears self-deception under the guise of zeal. "Whatsoever pleases me or serves my ends I labour for with an intensity and decision which looks like fervour," yet is offset, he fears, by "a great turn for sloth" (1) in affairs concerning which he is less deeply interested. He is conscious of the insidious temptation to ambition; yet "Since I came into the Truth . . . I cannot say that I have deliberately acted on my [? any] ambitious intention. . . . O my God, if in this [his successive promotions] there has been ambition, make me see it as Thou seest it, lest I go down to the pit deceiving myself." Again, "being set upon such a height, I feel a fear which no words can express. If the Holy Ghost is so near me, so, I believe, is the Spirit of Evil. I feel as if the whole atmosphere round me were alive and astir with the enemies of my soul. It is certain that I shall be assailed more than any man. . . . And my fall would be as when a standard-bearer falleth." Contrasting his later experiences with those of his Anglican days, "I know," he writes, that

"I have become, or at least have been accused of imperiousness, presumptiveness (*sic*), sharpness, suddenness, and the like. When I was in a system of compromise I tried to meditate [? mediate], reconcile, and unite together those who differed. When I entered a system which, being Divine, is definite and uncompromising, I threw myself with my whole soul and strength into its mind, will, and action. So it must be to the end. Less definite, positive, uncompromising, aggressive, I can never be. God forbid! But I will try to do it *charitate formatus*." He looks down from the garden at Highgate on a city of (then) "nearly three millions of men of whom only 200,000 are nominally of the Faith," in which "hundreds of thousands are living and dying without baptism, in all the sins . . . that Nineveh and the Cities of the Plain and Imperial Rome ever committed," and feels that "they will be my chalice more than ever. To labour and to suffer for souls who will not be redeemed. To go down into the fire and into the water to save souls and to be wounded by them—all this I look for. And I look to be chiefly wounded, as Jesus was, by my own brethren." Once more: "I propose to keep before me always St. Charles's devotion to the Burial of Jesus. I suppose he loved it because it was the most perfect humiliation of God Incarnate, to be taken down from the Cross, wound in linen, and hid out of sight in the earth which He had made."¹

Nor is it for a moment to be supposed that these were only the transient sentiments of a week of special favour. In every one of those conflicts to which reference has been made it was these sentiments, or the like, which animated him. It was assuredly no vulgar jealousy but a passionate love of souls, and an obsessing fear lest the apostolic work of his dear friend and master, Cardinal Wiseman, then weakening to his end, should be calamitously frustrated and brought to nought, that inspired his opposition to certain members of the Westminster Chapter, and his tireless but perfectly constitutional efforts (miscalled intrigues) that Archbishop Errington should be deprived of the right of succession to Wiseman. It was the same passionate love of souls which led him (however mistaken his judgment may have been) to engage in his campaign against the Religious Orders, and in particular the Society of Jesus. If it had been true—as he was persuaded that it was true—that so far from having been

¹ Pp. 161—7.

among the foremost champions of the Faith in the dark days of persecution, the members of the Society of Jesus had disastrously impeded the progress and revival of Catholicism in England; if it had been true—as he was persuaded that it was true—that the Religious Orders, and the Jesuits in particular, had even unconsciously helped to debase the tone and the spiritual standards of the secular clergy by setting before them low ideals, and by denying or ignoring the truth that real holiness of life is within the reach of a secular priest—then no words could have been too strong, no efforts too great, having for their purpose the mitigation of so fatal an evil. That these things were not so is, needless to say, my firm belief; but this belief is in no wise inconsistent with a sincere admiration for one who, being otherwise persuaded, acted consistently in accordance with his persuasion. And while we may regret in the great Cardinal a certain proneness to form, on insufficient grounds, judgments which were in accordance with his predispositions or preconceptions, and a certain readiness to impute unworthy motives to those who thought otherwise than he did, because his own view seemed to himself so transparently correct, we may thankfully acknowledge the good results of a struggle which indirectly at least had the effect of putting both seculars and regulars on their mettle, and of bringing home to all alike the paramount importance for the efficient carrying on of our Lord's work in the world, of aiming at the highest perfection which is within the capacity of every individual priest, be he secular or regular.

Nor, with the exception of that tendency to impute unworthy motives to opponents, itself born of the clearness with which he saw or seemed to himself to see the truth, can any fault be reasonably found with the strenuous and ceaseless efforts made by Manning at the time of the Vatican Council to secure the passing and to strengthen the terms of the great decree concerning the infallible teaching authority of the Pope. The word "intrigue," so freely used in this connection, is a question-begging term, and although Manning's own later reminiscences of that stormy time cannot always be implicitly trusted, it may safely be said that no single act of his, either before or during the sitting of the Council, can be justly charged with disingenuousness. It was, as he was convinced, the vital interests of the Church and the good of souls which were at stake, and for such a stake no stone

should be left unturned, no lawful method of influencing the decisions of his fellow Bishops should be left untried.

So, too, in the case of the long-drawn differences with Newman. Our sympathies may be on many or on most or even on all points with the great Oratorian. But who can question that Manning was inspired throughout with a real and deep-seated fear lest the teaching and action of Newman should gravely injure the cause which he had at heart by infecting Catholics with a spirit of "liberalism" and compromise, alike in doctrinal matters and in practical conduct? Nor does it in the least follow that because on certain matters Leo XIII. reversed the policy of Pius IX., therefore the time was already ripe for such a change in the days of Pius. It may be conjectured with at least some show of probability that the time was in more than one respect not yet ripe for a free permission to Catholics to frequent the schools of the Universities.

A biography of Manning, following upon Mr. Wilfrid Ward's fully documented *Lives of Wiseman* and of Newman, as well as upon the ill-starred work of E. S. Purcell, must, under penalty of much wearisome repetition, necessarily be characterized by a certain incompleteness, and must to some extent be in the nature of a supplementary volume. Hence it is that in Mr. Shane Leslie's pages the bulk of the Newman correspondence is omitted and must be "taken as read." The letters already published are, however, here supplemented by items of real importance. And, before introducing them to the notice of his readers, Mr. Leslie reminds us that "their differences," those of course of Manning and Newman, "were exaggerated by a horde of Protestant journalists, Catholic busy-bodies, and excitable converts."¹ "Out of their rivalry and suffering," he presently adds, "the strength and progress of the Church was moulded in England. Newman had to bear the balking of his schemes, and Manning had to endure to read on every brick thrown at him by critics the sacred initials J.H.N."² "Almost every newspaper in England," writes Manning himself, in his MS. reminiscences, "abused and ridiculed me. My name was never mentioned but his was brought in to condemn me; his name was never mentioned but mine was brought in to despise me. If only we had stood side by side and spoken the same thing, the dissension, division, and ill-will which

¹ P. 270.

² P. 271.

we have would never have been; and the unity of Catholic truth would have been irresistible. But it was not to be so." That it was not so he very characteristically ascribes, not to the quite inevitable divergence of views on matters concerning which the Church allows liberty of judgment, and to the misdirected diligence of "Protestant journalists, Catholic busy-bodies, and excitable converts," but to the fault, the unconscious fault he would no doubt have admitted, of Newman himself. "There is only one person who has kept Dr. Newman back from the highest office—himself. He is the sole cause." Again: "We diverged on public duties." But "my line was not my own. It is that of the Bishops in 1862, 1867, of the Holy See, and of the Vatican Council. . . . If I have been opposed to him, it has only been that I must oppose either him or the Holy See."¹ What, then, of his own efforts, perfectly legitimate of course, to influence the Holy See? Here were two men, each of highly strung sensitiveness, and each in a degree blind to the truth that their sensitiveness was not wholly and exclusively caused by the keen sense of the mischief to souls which each of them deemed the other to be perpetrating, while in fact each was doing God's work subject to the limitations of his own outlook and temperament. "I know Manning best, but I love Newman," said Cardinal Barnabo, and his words will find an echo in many Catholic hearts to-day.

Among the services secretly rendered by Manning to Newman, and now first brought to light, was the suppression, in 1866, of an article by W. G. Ward, "which had been examined and was considered to be calm and moderate and to contain nothing which ought not to be published," but which "for the peace of Jerusalem," as Mr. Leslie puts it, the Archbishop begged Ward not to print, as containing an attack on J.H.N. "Any internal variance," writes Manning to Ullathorne, "would be sure to be seized and used by the public opinion of this country and the Protestants as a division in the Church." Moreover, "I am most anxious that Dr. Newman should be spared all pain." To these reasons, it may be worth while to note, Ullathorne, in his reply, added the consideration that "it is a violation of a fundamental canon for a layman to pronounce judgment on the doctrine of a priest." Nay, Manning even went further, and suppressed a book of his own on the Blessed Virgin,

¹ Pp. 271—2.

"for fear of a collision with Newman."¹ Yet strange to say, it was this very incident of the suppressed *Dublin* article which, grossly misrepresented by gossip and rumour, and possibly by some imprudence on the part of so prudent a man as Bishop Ullathorne, led Newman to write to him: "I will say to your Lordship frankly that I cannot trust the Archbishop." For he had received the impression that Manning had sent the article to Ullathorne, not with the news of its suppression, but with a view to getting the Bishop's approval for its publication. A well-known correspondence between Manning and Newman followed, which ended in a long-enduring breach. "For years," says Manning, "we never wrote and never met."²

But the list of Manning's hitherto unknown services to Newman is not yet complete. In 1875 the latter's famous *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk* in reply to Gladstone's *Vaticanism* was, partly as it seems in consequence of a defective translation, somewhat unfavourably received in Rome, and "Propaganda called on Manning to invite Newman to make certain corrections." Manning, however, "had come to the conclusion that Newman was being ungenerously treated, and he sent a spirited defence of the illustrious Oratorian to Cardinal Franchi." The writer admits that the pamphlet contains "certain propositions and a certain method of reasoning which is not in accord with the accepted mode of expression." But the substance of the work is "wholesome," nor is any harm, either to Catholics or to Protestants, to be apprehended from the "faults" to which attention has been called. "On the other hand I see a grave danger if there should be a shade of public censure. . . . A Papal Bull would not be sufficient to destroy the belief that the Holy See had been inspired by the Ultramontanes of England. . . . Under the circumstances, I warmly implore you to leave what is well alone."³ That such a letter had been written in his defence, Newman never knew.

If Barnabo's words, quoted above, will, as has been said, find an echo in the hearts of many to whom the memory of Newman is very dear, on the other hand, there will be some who never had the privilege of knowing either, but who, after reading Ward's *Newman* and Leslie's *Manning*, will be inclined to say, rather, "Newman I admire, Manning I love." For, lonely as he was, and set apart from intimate friend-

¹ Pp. 274-6.² Pp. 276-7.³ P. 281.

ships with men of prominent position, he had a tender heart for the poor and the sick, the pauper and the prisoner, for innocent children and for the fallen and the degraded, on behalf of whom, not only as multitudes or classes, but as individuals, he would spare no pains and grudge no time and trouble. The man who wept when Canon Arthur Ryan told him there was still one link left between Ireland and England—"Your Eminence," the man to whom his old opponent, Canon Maguire, could say on occasion of one of the daily visits paid him while he lay on his deathbed, "the sound of your footsteps on the stair is music to my ear," the man who made thoughtful provision for the declining years of another ecclesiastic (Canon Searle), who in earlier days had proved himself all but a bitter enemy,—many will feel that this man assuredly earned, if not from all his contemporaries, at least from all Catholic posterity, a tribute not merely of admiration but of love.

Turning at last to other topics it is interesting to read once again (for the subject had not been passed over in silence by Purcell) how strongly Manning deprecated the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between Rome and England. The unfortunate lack of an *Index rerum* (there is an *Index personarum*) or of an analytical table of contents to Mr. Leslie's volume has prevented me from "turning up" at the moment all the relevant passages, but the following words sufficiently indicate Manning's point of view, and sufficiently account for his unwillingness to see a Nuncio at the Court of St. James or a British Ambassador to the Vatican:

I know that our Government tried to prevent the nomination of Dr. Walsh to the See of Dublin. Any such understanding, be it only verbal and tacit, between the Holy See and the Government would be in my judgment and belief fatal. Not only because or chiefly because many a good nomination would be hindered and many a bad one confirmed, but for a graver reason. No number of such mischiefs are comparable to the danger resulting to the Holy See. So long as the Irish people absolutely trust the Holy See in the nomination of Bishops, the faith and fidelity of the Irish people will be immutable. The day in which they begin to believe that the influence of the Protestant and anti-Catholic Government of England is felt at the Vatican in this most vital point they will be tempted not only to mistrust, but to all manner of spiritual evils.¹

¹ P. 393.

I have perforce omitted to touch on a great variety of matters that are dealt with at length in Mr. Leslie's admirable biography. For instance, the chapters, eight in number, which tell the story of Manning's Anglican life; the interesting account of his long correspondence with Florence Nightingale, whose strong leanings towards the Catholic Faith suffered so strange an eclipse after her return from the Crimea; the three chapters on Ireland with their interesting interchange of letters or visits between Manning on the one hand, and on the other, Cullen, McCabe, Croke, McEvilly, Walsh and other Irish prelates, Persico the Papal envoy, and, among English statesmen, Gladstone, Disraeli, Grey, Clarendon, and Carnarvon; the chapters on "The Day's Burden," "World Politics," "Rationalism and Literature," and, last to be here named, but by no means least, "The Coming of Democracy." Events in Ireland and in the industrial world follow one another with such bewildering rapidity that the words and acts of forty years ago seem already too remote from present conditions to be of an interest so vital as that which will be theirs when our after-war problems have found—if they ever do find—a stable solution. And for present purposes it may be enough to quote, as bearing on these two subjects, together with others, the paragraph with which Mr. Leslie concludes his biography:

What seemed to many of his own flock defects really led him towards the greater world policies of the future. His Ultramontaniam led him into opposition to Bismarck and Prussianism. His apparent Socialism led him into the policy by which the Church has since struggled to win and influence Labour. As his democratic policy has proved the only safeguard against the developments of Bolshevism, so his Irish views, if they had been adopted when they were expressed, would have prevented the British Empire being divided on the Irish rock, and his attempts to initiate union and understanding between the Hierarchies of England, Ireland, and the United States would have supplied that corner-stone without which there can never be peace or trust in the English-speaking world. Time and perhaps centuries will be needed to estimate his share in the dogmatic history of the Christian Church; but the present years have shown England how unwise it was to reject a prophet, whether he spoke warningly of Prussia or sympathetically of Ireland. No doubt the middle classes in England and the governing oligarchies rejected him both in religion and politics, but his funeral showed that it was upon the working classes that he had chiefly made his impression.

Englishman and Ultramontane, he may not have qualified for the blessing promised to the meek, but by his social and international action at least he earned the Beatitude which is promised to the peacemaker.¹

That Mr. Shane Leslie, who in his preface so severely criticises Purcell, has not been immune even from some of the kind of mistakes (*e.g.*, in transcription) with which he charges that writer, could I think be easily made good, especially in the case of Italian phrases, by a collation of some of the printed documents with Manning's script; and here and there statements are made (*e.g.*, that "the Jesuits" favoured Bishop Clifford as a suitable successor to Cardinal Wiseman) which would seem to rest rather on rumour and irresponsible gossip than on any evidence worthy of the name. But taken as a whole, the volume of which—under pressure of time and space—so inadequate an account has here been given affords very little scope for the exercise of the thankless task of fault-finding. It is a worthy tribute to the memory of a great Cardinal.

HERBERT LUCAS.

¹ P. 497.

A Sign to be contradicted: "That God Himself should have come on earth in human form in order to redeem and beatify man, and that, nineteen centuries after His coming, the vast majority of the race should be in ignorance of the fact, whilst multitudes, having heard of it, should yet disbelieve the report, is one of the standing puzzles of history. *A priori* we should have thought that a divine interposition of such incalculable benefit to mankind would be eagerly welcomed and speedily made known everywhere, as an event of inexhaustive significance; whereas belief in its occurrence has met with undying hostility, both in the heart of the individual and amongst the race at large. Being a divine fact, its influence has survived that hostility and made way in spite of it, but that persistent opposition has sadly checked its natural fecundity of growth. Hence it is that there are multitudes still in the outer darkness and many on whom the Light of the world once shone but who have made a darkness for themselves by closing their eyes to it."—*The Month*, January, 1908.

"THE CONFINES OF THE KNOWN MATERIAL UNIVERSE"

"TWO things fill my mind with ever-renewed wonder and awe, the more often and the deeper I dwell on them: the starry vault above me, and the moral law within me." The aphorism is that of the idealistic philosopher, Immanuel Kant, and without subscribing in any way to his system of philosophy, we cannot but admire the justice of his sentiment. For the vastness of the depths of the heavens has ever impressed the mind of man. With every increase in the optical power of the instruments at the command of the astronomer he probes ever deeper and deeper into the realms of space. He has possibly fathomed the dimensions of the starry galaxy, bounded by the luminous clouds of the Milky Way, of which galaxy our relatively puny solar system constitutes a member. But the number of the nebulae or clouds of star-mist, as they have not ineptly been called, multiply with each addition to the light-grasping power of the giant telescopes of modern times.

The number of stars in our system is certainly not less than 1,000 million, and probably is nearer 2,000 million. And the scale on which they are distributed in space is enormous. To gauge the distance of an inaccessible object one must measure a base-line and view it from each end of the base-line. It will then form the apex of a triangle of which the base and the two adjoining angles are known. It becomes an easy task to solve the triangle and to find the perpendicular distance of the object from the base, or the angle at the apex subtended by half the base. This angle is called the parallax of the object. Or in other words, the parallax of an inaccessible object is its apparent displacement due to the real displacement of the observer. For nearer objects in the celestial spaces one might employ as the base-line the equatorial diameter of the earth, or the distance between two observatories placed approximately at the extremities of such a diameter. But for the stars the base-line is the diameter of the earth's orbit about the sun, a distance of twice 92,800,000 miles. Now there is no star so near the earth that the distance of the earth from the sun, or a line of

92,800,000 miles, subtends an angle of even one second of arc. A man six feet in height seen at a distance of about 200 miles would subtend an angle of one second of arc. It would obviously be no easy matter to measure his height with a micrometer attached to a telescope at such a distance.

A more familiar illustration may help to bring home to us the distances of the stars. Some years ago it was computed that the total length of cotton thread produced by all the Lancashire mills in a day was 155 million miles. At this rate of output, it would take the mills 400 years to make a thread to reach to the star α Centauri, one of the nearest of the fixed stars, the parallax of which is a little over three-quarters of a second of arc.

A convenient unit for expressing the distances of the stars is one light-year, or the distance that light, which moves at the velocity of 186,000 miles a second, would travel in one year. On this scale a parallax of one second of arc would correspond to 3.262 light-years. Light, moving with its extremely great velocity, would take $4\frac{1}{2}$ years to come to our eyes from α Centauri, and 9 years on its journey from Sirius.

Let us picture to ourselves in imagination a celestial passenger starting from the sun on a journey into space, on the vehicle of a sunbeam. In eight minutes he would have traversed the 92,800,000 miles that separate the earth from the sun. One second and a half would have taken him to the full moon. In four hours he would have reached the orbit of Neptune, the outermost planet of our system, about thirty times further from the sun than is the earth. He has now fairly started on his journey towards the starry firmament, and he reaches the nearest sun to our own sun in about four years. When he has passed some nine or ten additional stars, celestial milestones of his flight into space, he has attained a distance about a million times as far from the sun as is the earth, and he has taken 16 years on the journey. After a journey of 500 light-years he can look back on a space containing about a million stars, a mere fraction of the more than 1,000 million which constitute our galaxy. The cloud masses of stars of the Milky Way mark the goal of his present flight, and these he may hope to penetrate in about 20,000 to 30,000 years!

Not even then has our light-borne passenger exhausted all the possibilities of his flight, for if he is so minded, he

can proceed further afield towards the globular clusters and the spiral nebulae. At this enormous distance to which he has already been carried, the radius of the earth's orbit about the sun would measure something of the order of 0.0001", one ten-thousandth of a second of arc.

But surely, it will be urged, such minute angles are not measurable. While then our celestial passenger is resting at the confines of the clouds of the Milky Way, we may explain how such huge distances may be in some cases directly, and in many cases indirectly, measured.

The spectroscope is truly a marvellous instrument of research in astronomical physics. Not only does it reveal to us the constitution of the heavenly bodies by an analysis of their light, but it also can give us, by means of the displacements of the spectral lines, a knowledge of the value of that component of the star's total velocity which is directed in the line of sight of the observer. More than this, it can be employed to measure the distances of stars, however remote, so long as their spectrum is capable of being photographed.

The principle which underlies the method is that employed in photometry. The unit of intensity of illumination on a unit square on a screen is that given by a unit candle placed at unit distance. For instance, we might choose as our unit of candle power, the intensity of illumination on a square inch of a screen directed normally to the rays of a standard candle placed at the distance of a foot from the screen. If a point of light placed at 6 feet distance from the screen gave an intensity of illumination on the screen equal to that given by the standard candle at one foot distance, then the candle power of the source of light would be 36. For the illuminating power, or luminosity of a source of light, which is something intrinsic, bears to the intensity of illumination it gives on a screen, a ratio which is measured by the square of its distance from the screen. Conversely, if we knew its luminosity and its intensity of illumination on the screen we should know its distance. If our 36 candle-power point of light gave an intensity of one-quarter of a standard candle on the screen, then its distance would be 12 feet from the screen. Practically, then, it comes to this, that in comparing the luminosities of different sources of light, we equivalently place them all at the distance of our unit, or standard candle, from the screen.

Let us apply this to the stars. For the unit area which receives the light on the screen we have the pupil of the eye. Now stars are of different apparent lustre, which depends upon their differences in intrinsic luminosity and on their distances from the observer. Moreover, so far as their apparent brightness is concerned, they are arranged arbitrarily in classes or magnitudes. Each magnitude denotes an apparent lustre which is nearly 2.512 times as bright as the succeeding magnitude. Thus a first magnitude star seems to be 100 times as bright as a sixth magnitude star, which is a star just visible to the naked eye. It is evident that, similarly to the procedure in the photometry of terrestrial sources of light, we could calculate the distance of a star if we knew its apparent magnitude, and its luminosity when placed at a selected distance and compared to a standard source of light.

As the unit of luminosity corresponding to the standard candle we have the sun. In the arbitrary scale of apparent stellar magnitudes the sun would be of the -26.5 magnitude, while Sirius, the brightest star in the heavens, is -1.6 magnitude. There is therefore a difference of approximately 25 magnitudes between the sun and Sirius. This means that to our eyes the sun appears to be about ten thousand million times as bright as Sirius. But in reality Sirius is actually 48 times as bright as our Sun, and would appear to be so if the Sun and Sirius were placed at the same distance from the eye of the observer.

We must therefore choose, besides a celestial standard candle, namely the sun, a unit distance at which all the stars and the Sun could be viewed in order to compare their intrinsic luminosities or absolute magnitudes. This distance is the distance corresponding to a parallax $0.1''$, a tenth of a second of arc, or 33 light-years. The absolute magnitude of a star is defined to be its apparent magnitude when reduced to this unit distance. On this scale the absolute magnitude of the Sun, the unit of luminosity, would be 5. A simple formula connects the absolute magnitude of a star, its apparent magnitude, and its parallax or distance. The apparent magnitude of any star can be accurately determined according to any well-established photometric scale of sequences, either visual or photographic. If the absolute magnitude can be found then the distance is known.

It is here that the spectroscope comes to the aid of the astronomer. It is known that some radiations of the chemi-

cal elements betoken a low temperature, and corresponding luminosity, and others a high temperature. Their degree of strength in a star's spectrum is an indication of its physical condition, and serves as a delicate pyrometer to gauge its relative temperature, and hence its absolute magnitude. For instance, a radiation of calcium at wave-length 4455 is greatly strengthened in the star 61 Cygni, and is weakened in the star α Tauri, while the opposite conditions obtain with regard to a radiation of strontium at wave-length 4216. Now laboratory and solar researches have shown that this particular radiation of calcium is one that increases in strength with reduction of temperature. The opposite condition obtains with regard to the named radiation of strontium. It is one indicative of high temperature, and is found in the electric spark spectrum of the element, and in the hotter layers of the sun's atmosphere.

The discovery was made by Dr. Adams of the Mount Wilson Observatory, and it is a discovery of prime importance, that the stars can be graded according to the strengths of such radiations in their spectra, and that the intensity of the radiations bears a numerical relationship to the absolute magnitudes of the stars in which they occur. Curves can be plotted expressing this relationship graphically, and by their aid, given the strength of the spectral radiations, the absolute luminosity, and hence the parallax of the star can be determined. The accuracy of this method of deriving parallaxes from the intensities of spectral radiations, depends upon a knowledge of the parallaxes of the stars, used for the determination of the relationship between absolute magnitude and the intensities of the selected spectral rays.

Some 1,600 stars have now been investigated by this method at Mount Wilson, including nearly all the stars the parallaxes of which had been previously determined by trigonometrical methods, and hardly a single serious contradiction has been found in the spectroscopic and trigonometric parallaxes. This is a splendid testimony to the accuracy of the method. It is evidently capable of extension to stars, however distant, of which the spectrum can be obtained.

The whole solar system is moving bodily in the direction of the brilliant star Vega with a velocity of 12.2 miles per second. Thus the annual motion of the sun in space amounts to four times the radius of the earth's orbit, and its centennial

motion to 400 times this distance. We have here a mighty base-line which can be applied to the measurement of the distance of groups of stars. The apparent displacement of a star due to this motion of the sun is called the parallax motion, and by finding the parallax motion in arc of any class of stars, their average distance can be found. The method is not applicable to any particular star because its total displacement is made up of the parallax motion and its own individual proper motion, but only for a group of stars which has no proper motion relative to the other stars. It would be possible analogously to find by triangulation the distance of a swarm of gnats hovering over a pond, but not of an individual gnat which is moving about in the swarm. Such individual movements, being indiscriminately in all directions, will cancel out in the mean.

Other indirect methods of obtaining the distances of groups of heavenly bodies, which cannot be effected by astronomical triangulation, are founded on the considerations of the magnitudes, periods, light-curves, and radial velocities of variable stars, on the angular diameters of clusters, and on the number, magnitudes, and colours of the stars composing them. These methods have been applied with conspicuous success by Dr. Harlow Shapley, of the Mount Wilson Observatory, in a recent series of papers, particularly to the evaluation of the distances of globular clusters.

But it is time to return to our celestial voyager. His light-some vehicle has suffered but very little, if any, deterioration, by absorption or scattering during his long voyage to the confines of our system. He has arrived at the shores of a starry continent, and beyond lie the islands of the globular clusters and spiral nebulae. Before he determines on further journeyings into space, we had better point out to him the mileage in light-years of the celestial objects still to be reached, as reckoned from the sun as a centre.

The cluster in Hercules is a truly glorious object which can be easily seen by the naked eye on a fine night. A photographic plate of this cluster, taken with an exposure of 11 hours by means of the great 5-foot reflector at Mount Wilson, shows 26,700 component stars outside the central zones where superposition of the numerous star images begins. This was the first cluster exhaustively studied both by Dr. Harlow Shapley, and independently by Professor Hertzsprung. They agree in their estimate of its distance from

the sun, which is 100,000 light-years, that is, the light by which we see it on any fine night by the naked eye, left it 100,000 years ago, and has been travelling at the rate of 186,000 miles a second ever since it started on its way. Its diameter is 1,100 light-years. According to Dr. Shapley, the most distant globular cluster known is New General Catalogue, 7006, which is at a distance of 220,000 light-years, while the nearest is 21,000 light-years from us. Between these extreme limits of distance there are 69 globular clusters.

It is probable that at least 700,000, and possibly one million spiral nebulae are capable of being photographed by large reflectors. Spiral nebulae are more crowded about the regions of the poles of the Milky Way than in the regions of its equator. Counts of the number of spirals photographed enabled Dr. Curtis to give the number per square degree of the sky, referred to the belt of the Milky Way. To arrive at the total number given, the reasonable assumption must be made that the density per square degree, for different regions of the sky, is the same in all square degrees, besides those actually counted.

Dr. Max Wolf, of Heidelberg, assumed that the spiral nebulae were external galaxies, an opinion which is shared by many astronomers, and that on the average all of them were of the same order of actual magnitude. If this is so, then their apparent diameters are inversely as their distances, and the apparent diameters are of course measurable quantities. He took the parallax of the new star of 1901 in Perseus, situated in the Milky Way, as a standard of reference. Its annual parallactic displacement was only the one-hundredth of a second of arc. With this as a fiducial point he assigned to one of the nearer spirals a distance of 33,000 light-years, and a diameter measured by 1,100 light-years. This latter number is the same as that for the diameter of the cluster of Hercules derived by Dr. Harlow Shapley. One of the most distant of the spirals has, on this basis of computation, a diameter of 1,300 light-years and a distance of 578,000 light-years.

One indirect method of attacking the problem as to the distances of the spiral nebulae, which has been employed both by Dr. Shapley and Dr. Curtis, is based upon a consideration of the magnitudes of the new stars which from time to time burst out in these spirals. The new stars con-

nected with spiral nebulae are on the average 8 magnitudes less bright than those which have been observed in the Milky Way. Hence the spiral nebulae, with which they are presumably physically connected, must be 64 times as far from us as are the new stars of our galaxy. This would place them at a distance of not less than 100,000 light-years.

If a photograph of a spiral nebula be examined it will be noted that the condensations on the spiral arms are not resolved into separate stars. There are festoons or bunches of stars. This irresolvability involves, unless the masses are really flocculous, representing uncondensed suns, that the stars in the condensations must be fainter than the 21st magnitude. In this case they are several millions of light-years away from the sun.

These are extreme values. In a recent paper¹ by Dr. Adrian van Maanen he states that the mean maximum of 15 then known *novae* in spiral nebulae was magnitude 14.7. Their minimum must have been below the twentieth apparent magnitude. Supposing that they reached the same absolute magnitude at maximum, namely 6.9, as the three new stars in our galaxy whose distances have been actually measured, then the mean parallax for the spiral nebulae in which they appeared must be .00003", or about 1,000,000 light-years. It will be noted that this distance is in substantive agreement with that derived by Shapley for the globular clusters. The distances of two spirals, No. 224 and No. 5194 of the New General Catalogue, he ascertained by direct measures, and found that their parallaxes can hardly surpass 0.01", which would bring them as near as 330 light-years. This would be an extremely low value.

Let us take an illustrative example, and suppose a spiral nebula, which may have an apparent diameter of 10 minutes of arc, to be at a distance of twenty million light-years. Its actual diameter would in that case be 60,000 light-years, which is of the order of magnitude of that of our stellar system. In other words, if our whole stellar system, with its 1,000 million and more component stars, were taken off into space, and placed at a distance from us of twenty million light-years, it would look something like a globular cluster of stars with an apparent diameter of 10 minutes of arc. And it is a reasonable presumption to suppose, in view of

¹ The Photographic Determination of Stellar Parallaxes with the 60-inch Reflector. Contributions, Mount Wilson Observatory, No. 158.

modern studies on the formation of stellar systems, that a globular cluster is the outcome of the gradual condensation of the matter of a spiral nebula, and hence originally that our stellar system was a spiral nebula.

We have finished our journey to the confines of the starry firmament, and in conclusion we may state that the question as to the spiral nebulae being systems of stars entirely separated from and independent of our galaxy still remains an open one. The weight of evidence, derived from different lines of thought, based on parallaxes obtained directly and indirectly, is somewhat conflicting. The trend of opinion, however, seems to incline to the belief that the spirals are "island universes," an expressive term coined by that first great surveyor of the starry depths, Sir William Herschel, entirely distinct from our own system of stars.

According to the modern electrical theory of matter, an atom must be considered to be a composite structure, made up of a heavy but minutely charged nucleus, the charge being positive, and a surrounding configuration of electrons which are charged negatively. Since an atomic system is neutral, it follows that the number of electrons circulating round the nucleus must be such as to carry a total charge equal to the free positive charge on the nucleus. Moreover, it has been experimentally proved, that the number of free positive charges on the atoms of different substances is approximately equal to half their atomic weight. Inside all the atoms there are a definite number of positive and negative electrons which do not differ from one another in quantity of charge, but do differ in mass and in volume. Now the value of the diameter of the atom of the monatomic gas helium is 2 multiplied by 10 to the minus eighth power of a centimeter, about the 80 millioneth part of an inch.¹ Its atomic weight is 4. Hence an atom of helium would constitute a system with a nucleus of two positive charges, around which circulate two electrons with negative charges. The diameter of the molecule of the diatomic gas hydrogen slightly exceeds this value, and those of the molecules of oxygen and nitrogen are half as much again.

Nor must we imagine that the electrons which constitute an atom occupy anything like the major part of the space contained within such minute limits. For experiments again conclusively demonstrate that the electrons of an atom occupy

¹ Millikan, *The Electron*, p. 181.

but a very small fraction of the space containing the atomic system. To the astronomer the interesting point is that the constituents of any atom of matter are arranged on an excessively reduced scale as a miniature solar system.

The electrons are as small relatively to the dimensions of an atomic system, as the sun and his attendant planets are to the space which is encircled by the orbit of Neptune. The diameter of the orbit of this, the outermost known planet of our solar system, may be reckoned as twice its mean distance from the sun, or twice 2,792 millions of miles. The diameter of the sun is 866,500 miles. The diameter of the sun therefore is contained some 6,000 times in the diameter of the orbit of Neptune.

According to the experiments of Sir Ernest Rutherford, the limits of the dimensions of the nuclei of atoms are between the minus twelfth and the minus thirteenth power of 10 of a centimeter, or about the four hundred-thousandth of the millioneth part of an inch. This would make the diameter of the nucleus or sun of an atomic system to be in no case larger than the one ten thousandth of the diameter of the atom. Hence not only in position, but also in relative scale to the confines of its system, does the central positively charged nucleus of an atom resemble the central sun of the solar system. An atom is a replica of a solar system.

The confines of the material universe so far as they are known to men, extend from the dimensions of a distance of about a million light-years, to the four hundred-thousandth of the millioneth part of an inch. But is it not wonderful that we should find the type of the sun's mighty system reproduced on such a minute scale in the atom of matter? This unity in design and in orderly arrangement necessarily betokens an intelligent First Cause, the Creator of Heaven and of earth.

A. L. CORTIE.

RIGHT AND WRONG NOTIONS OF PRAYER

THE Schoolmen are fond of dividing, as divisions make for clearness. But divisions may be carried to excess, and when the old Greek philosopher argues that Achilles can never overtake the tortoise, because, before compassing the whole, he would always have to cover half the intervening distance, Achilles and common-sense step over the whole, and smile at philosopher and tortoise plodding behind.

Asceticism may and even must borrow from philosophy, but asceticism is not philosophy, and when the logician, however amicably, busies himself with our prayers, we may resent his intrusion into the sanctuary. A recent work on Prayer draws a hard and fast distinction between vocal and mental prayer: "Mental prayer is that which is made without employing either words or formulas of any kind." "Vocal prayer is that which is made by using words or signs, etc." (Lehodey, *Ways of Mental Prayer*, p. 5). It is interesting to set side by side with this categorical statement the words of Ven. Father Baker, in his well-known book, *Holy Wisdom*: "Hence it follows that the ordinary division of prayer into vocal and mental is improper, because the parts of the division are coincident; for vocal prayer, as distinguished from (and much more, as opposed to) mental, is indeed no prayer at all" (*Holy Wisdom*, p. 343). And again: "As for vocal prayer, it is not to be esteemed a peculiar degree of prayer; but it may and doth accompany all these states without any change in the substance of the prayer" (*ib.* p. 402). Already in the early years of the seventeenth century he could write: "As for discursive prayer or meditation, the world is but over-burdened with books, which, with more than sufficient niceness, prescribe rules and methods for the practice of it" (*ib.* p. 349). And to this alarming stock we have added the libraries of three centuries!

The inclination to pigeon-hole our spirituality is an old one. We find Cassian, in his *Collations* (ix. 9), enumerating four degrees of perfection in ordinary prayer. These he bases on St. Paul's exhortation that "supplications, prayers,

intercessions and thanksgiving be made for all men." Supplications he assigns to the Purgative way, prayers and intercessions to the Illuminative, whilst thanksgiving is the prayer of the perfect in the Unitive. It is easy to see how fanciful and artificial such a division is, and how narrowing it is, in fact, for the growth of the sinner's soul to limit his spiritual food to acts of supplication. It is not difficult to detect the fallacy of an age, as distant in mental outlook as in years from the age in which we live; but it is hard to break through the wall of prejudice that contemporary thought and habitual training may have built around us. How grudgingly of late years has the pedagogue consented to leave aside old Euclid and to guide the young mind into the fields of geometry by routes which did not traverse the well-worn "bridge of asses"!

The epithet "mental" seems to have been first applied to prayer in the sixteenth century. It was the epithet that was new, not the prayer underlying it. The philosopher ruled the world of thought, and what more congenial or appropriate work could he have than to circumscribe the boundaries of the soul's operations, and to measure its spiritual progress by the compartment it occupied in his division of prayer!

Before many years had elapsed, the division of prayer into "mental" and "vocal" had become classic, and no ascetical writer could ignore it. "Everybody knows the first and usual classification of prayer whereby it is divided into vocal and mental, the former of which is more known, the latter more select: the former more easy, the latter more difficult: the former commoner, the latter more rare" (Alvarez de Paz, *Opera*, v. 80). This passage from a great spiritual writer of the seventeenth century is very instructive. It shows us what had now been accomplished by the introduction and systematic use of the "divisions of prayer."

The division, "vocal" and "mental," had become established and almost sacred in character. We are on the threshold of an exoteric and an esoteric doctrine of prayer. One is well known to the common herd of lip-worshippers; the other is more hidden. No Christian, who has attained the use of reason, is unequal to "vocal" prayer; but multitudes know nothing of the prayer which is the expression of the "mind alone." And so there follows a large quarto volume of some 500 pages to unlock the doors of many folds, leading into the Chamber of Prayer.

"Christian" first waits in the ante-chamber of remote preparation, until, chastened and expectant, he may enter through the door of immediate preparation and hope for the moving tableaux of memory, understanding and will, to pass before his somewhat bewildered gaze!

Our quarrel surely is not with the masters of spirituality, nor with the well-assured facts of their science. But we cannot help feeling annoyed with those who, consciously or unconsciously, would have us believe that it is impossible to walk in the ways of mental prayer without stilts. We are reminded of M. Jourdain, the Bourgeois Gentilhomme, who discovered, with astonishment, that for forty years he had been speaking prose without knowing it; and that his modest request to have his slippers and night-cap brought to him, was as genuine a bit of prose as the highest oratory.

In the spiritual life, many a novice who has poured over the manuals of mental prayer, and courageously tried to work their elaborate machinery, would be even more surprised to learn that already he has frequently indulged in successful meditations without suspecting it, and that the difficulties which he now experiences are created by the unfamiliar setting of the daily operations of his mind.

The evil does not lie in drawing a certain distinction between "vocal" and "mental" prayer. The Canon Law supposes such a general distinction (cf. Canons, 125, 595, etc.). The evil lies in so pressing the distinction as to draw such a complete line of demarcation between the two, that the aspirant to sanctity fancies that he has to learn a new art, with a new notation.

To the Saints and to the great Masters of the Spiritual Life, prayer in its highest and its lowest phases was a conversation, a chatting with God,—"*colloquium cum Deo*" (St. Chrysostom, *Hom. in Gen.*, 30). Whatever differences they recognized in prayer—and they did recognize differences—came from the nature of the conversation, and therefore from the attitude of the soul to God. All conversation is coloured by the relationship which exists between the speakers. With strangers the conversation is formal; it tends to enclose itself in set phrases on set themes. With foreigners it may be very laboured, and even carried on by means of a conversational grammar. Between parent and child, as between lover and friend, it is intimate. The closer the union of hearts the less need there is for many words to communicate ideas,

which the sympathetic glance of an understanding love reflects as in a mirror.

Such was our Saviour's lesson, when He taught His disciples how to pray. Beginners in the spiritual life, they had heard of formularies. John had taught his disciples a method; would not the Master, too, found a school of prayer, and give His disciples their fixed formulary? (Luke xi.). The answer is as comforting as it is instructive: "And when you pray, speak not much as the heathens, for they think that in their much speaking they may be heard. Be not therefore like to them, for your Father knoweth what is needful for you before you ask him. Thus therefore shall you pray: Our Father who art in Heaven, etc." (Matt. vi. 7.9).

We have thought it well to couple the passage in St. Luke with that in St. Matthew's Gospel. In both we have the explicit teaching of our Lord on the manner of praying. Prayer is a heart to heart chat with "the Father Who seeth in secret." No elaborate string of words is needed. The child and the Father are together, and they talk. At one time it is about the interests of the Father, the glory of His name, His wonderful home, where neither rust nor moth can consume. At another about the interests of the child, his daily needs, the debts he has contracted, the love he will extend to the other children of the kingdom, and the evils which threaten to engulf them all. But the idea of the Fatherhood of God is supreme: it should colour all our prayers. "If then you, being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father from Heaven give the good spirit to them that ask him?" (Luke xi. 13). "Your Father knoweth that you have need of these things" (Matt. vi. 32). Our Saviour draws no hard and fast distinction between "vocal" and "mental" prayer. Prayer is above all a matter of the heart: "Now there remain faith, hope and charity; these three; but the greatest of these is charity" (I Cor. xiii. 13).

If then there be no sharp line of distinction between them, why do our masters insist so much on the necessity and the advantages of mental as distinct from vocal prayer? The early Christians seem to have been but little troubled with analyzing the nature of their prayer. The answer would seem to be that the gradual growth of devotions—excellent in themselves—such as the Rosary, Litanies, etc., the diffusion of set forms of prayer by the prayer-book, when the

printers' art encouraged their composition and facilitated their circulation, all tended to interfere with the spontaneity of conversation, to bring about that state of which God complains through His prophet: "This people honours me with their lips, but their heart is far from me" (Matt. xv. 8). We might perhaps add that the almost universal custom of making the child's first lesson in prayer consist in learning and repeating words, which he cannot possibly understand, helps in no small measure to encourage a form of prayer in which the lion's share of the work falls to the lips.

Thus however sacred and dear to all Christians the "Our Father" and the "Hail Mary" rightly are, and ever will be, one might well question the advisability of inviting tiny little tots to take their first peep into Heaven, through the mysteries of a "Kingdom to come," and a painful stumbling over "trespasses," of which they are as happily ignorant as they are fortunately free from temptation! A large number of those Christians, who are faithful to their morning and night prayers, never vary the formula which they have learned in childhood: indeed, many would fancy that they had failed in a duty were they to do so. We have even known of one, who for years repeated the prayer, taught him by a nurse, that God would "Bless his father, mother, brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts," though he never had the luxury of even one aunt! "I will pray with the spirit, I will pray also with the understanding" (I Cor. xiv. 15).

There is little wonder that ascetics should call for prayer "with the understanding"; but as little wonder that the claims of the understanding should in course of time usurp an unmerited sway.

"Mental" prayer is a generic term, but not a few writers use it as synonymous with discursive prayer. This use, or rather abuse, is extremely unhappy, and has helped to cramp souls in their efforts at mental prayer. St. Jane Frances de Chantal had occasion to complain that the prayer of simplicity was "strongly opposed by those whom God led by the way of reasoning, and many of our sisters have been troubled in this manner, being told that they were idle and wasting time. But without wishing to be wanting in the respect that I owe to these persons, I assure you, my very dear sisters, that you should not turn aside from your road for such talk." And again: "The advice of religious persons is usually much opposed to this, which is a great source of trouble to the

daughters (of the Visitation) and sometimes to those who rule over them" (Letters to M. Favre, *Plon*, Ed. III. 1053).

St. John of the Cross, in a very forcible passage, inveighs against the difficulties put in the way of souls by blind guides: "And the blind guides which can lead it astray are three, viz., the spiritual director, the devil, and its own self. . . . These directors knowing how to guide beginners only, —and God grant they may know that!—will not suffer their penitents to advance, though it be the will of God, beyond the mere rudiments, acts of reflection and imagination, whereby their progress is extremely little" (*Living Flame*, tr. by Lewis, p. 77).

There can be no doubt that a regular school of discursive prayer had been formed in the ascetical world. Discursive prayer was looked upon as the bread and butter of the spiritual life, and it was an unhealthy sign if a soul, unless far advanced in the way of the saints, were inclined to eschew it. Father Nouet, in his *Conduite de l'homme d'oraison*, writes: "When the man of prayer has made considerable progress in meditation," he passes to affective prayer.

This is surely not the teaching of the saints, and it is reassuring to read in such an orthodox and widely respected writer as Rodriguez (Vol. I. tr. V. c. 6) "that all the Saints establish the three sorts of prayer (viz., discursive, affective, contemplative) according to the three sorts of ways, purgative, illuminative, and unitive." Now the illuminative way is not the privilege of the ecstatic nor of the mystic; the ordinary devout soul habitually travels by it. The demon of Jansenism, with drawn sword, may meet him on his way and point to the valley of Penitence below, scowling at his audacity in venturing beyond it. But he is aware of a gracious and winsome presence, of outstretched arms ever inviting the weary and the burthened, ever inviting the sinner to enjoy the more abundant life, because the load of sin has been removed from the yearning heart, and the "living water, a fountain springing up into life everlasting," may be had by the erstwhile adulterous woman for the asking (John iv. 10, etc.).

A Pontifical decree was needed to remove the barrier of the purgative way, erected by rigorists between the soul and the altar rail: but rigorists are not easily suppressed, and so it had to be later provided that "after the publication of this decree, all ecclesiastical writers are to cease from con-

tentious controversies concerning the dispositions requisite for daily and frequent Communion" (Decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Council on Daily Communion; Dec. 20, 1905).

Little wonder then that we find those who exact "considerable progress in meditation" before the soul can indulge in the closer union of affective prayer with the Lover of Souls. It was an old complaint, and it comes from a suspect quarter—that "He was gone to be a guest with a man that was a sinner" (Luke xix. 7), or that He could not be a prophet "or He surely would not allow the woman that was a sinner" to rest so familiarly at His feet!

In the early centuries it was not uncommon for a writer to launch his work upon the world under the ægis of a great name—an Ambrose, an Augustine, a Cyprian—thereby to secure its success. Methodic discursive prayer has been so far fathered on St. Ignatius as to give rise to the appellation the "Ignatian Method"; in fact, it was not so long ago since an article was published, in which the writer is at some pains to wrest from the Jesuits any claim to methodical meditation as a family heirloom (*Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Sept. 1920).

Whatever individual sons of the Company might think of the claim, it is certain that their Father and Founder was very far from willing them such a legacy. His teaching is very clear, that for each one that form of prayer is best in which God communicates Himself more to him: "For God sees and knows what best suits us, and knowing all, points out to us, Himself, the way to follow. We must experiment in order to find it, before we discover the kind of prayer which will lead us to everlasting life" (Letter to St. Francis Borgia). And again: "All meditation where the understanding works, fatigues the body. There are other meditations, equally in the order of God, which are restful, full of peace for the understanding, without labour for the interior faculties of the soul, and which are performed without either physical or interior effort" (Letter to Sister Rejadella, 1536).

In the Constitutions of the Order, where he is formally regulating the spiritual exercises, besides the examinations of conscience the only form of prayer he prescribes is the Little Office of the B.V.M., with other prayers according to each one's devotion. And he is careful to put a note that this recitation of the Office may, according to the dis-

cretion of Superiors, be replaced by meditations and other spiritual exercises. The only point they are to look to is the real measure of devotion for each individual, since individual souls are led by different routes in the spiritual life.

The method styled "Ignatian" is culled from the Spiritual Exercises. But in these Exercises there are no less than seven different methods of prayer offered to the exercitant. If in the book of the Exercises the Saint is very careful about the smallest detail of method in meditation, it is because the Exercises are confined to a limited period and aim at a very definite object. Aimless wandering through the spiritual meadow would be fatal to the desired result. Nowhere in his writings, or in his letters, or in his spiritual direction does the Saint suggest that the minutiae of the Exercises should regulate our daily prayer. He demands above all that the soul should throughout the day "pay a loving attention to God as present with us, and should offer Him all its works."

Whatever dividing line we draw between vocal and mental prayer really depends on the nature of this attention. Without attention of the mind there is no prayer. A limited or lower grade of attention, directing the movement of the lips, constitutes that prayer which is usually called vocal; whilst a keener alertness of soul, a larger outlook on the spiritual world, however active or inactive the lips may be, is that raising of the soul to God which we call mental prayer. In a subsequent article we hope to examine in detail the nature of this attention and the phases of prayer to which it may give rise.

GEORGE BYRNE.

In a glass, darkly: "If we insist upon perfect intelligibility and complete declaration in every moral subject, we shall instantly fall into the misery of unbelief. Our whole happiness and power of energetic action depend on our being able to breathe and live in the cloud: content to see it opening here and closing there: rejoicing to catch, through the thinnest films of it, glimpses of stable and substantial things: but yet perceiving a nobleness in the concealment and rejoicing that the kindly veil is spread where the untempered light might have scorched us or the infinite clearness wearied."—*Ruskin: Modern Painters. V.*

A REALITY OF WAR

IN every army there will always be a large proportion of men whose power of facing and enduring danger rests substantially on their innate gregarious instincts. It is not merely that the example of one brave man will always infect his comrades and drug their hesitation into boldness, but that the mere abstract fact of association with others, the sense of fellowship, of solidarity, of co-operation, gives to all a courage and a composure above what any single individual could probably claim for himself alone. How often did one experience the bracing effect of human companionship on one's own uneasy nerves when, for instance, after a solitary tramp across the horrible emptiness of the trench-area, in the midst of that unstable silence which always seemed to be on the verge of breaking into deadly uproar, one saw in the distance a single khaki figure moving among the formless litter of that strange landscape. One's balance was at once re-established and one's flagging spirits revived by even so slight an evidence of fellowship with one's kind.

Apart from the constitutional coward, who is as truly a victim of disease as the neurasthenic or the epileptic, the average normal man has as much personal courage as will be demanded by the profession of arms.

"Thank the Lord," said a young officer, in a moment of expansion just after an action. "I thought I was a funk, but I find I'm not."

Where the really brave man differs from the rest is not in unintelligent insensibility to danger but in command of himself, in spite, perhaps, of a keen sensitiveness to it.

A story is told, and I believe it is authentic, which quite illustrates this point. A Company commander, of the traditional type that "doesn't know what danger is," noticed that one of his subalterns, as they stood in the front line waiting to go over in a raid, was feeling his position very painfully.

"You're shivering," he said, scornfully; "you're in a funk."

"Yes, I am," answered the other; "and if you were in anything like the funk that I'm in you'd be halfway to Calais by now."

Of course the soldier is not always thinking of the risks that he runs any more than a bricklayer, working on a lofty building, is always thinking of the depths below him. Use and habit may accustom one to almost anything, as one learnt from one's experience of life in the shell area. But even so, there are occasions when the terror of imminent death descends suddenly and unheralded upon the hardiest spirit, appalling him into literal paralysis of mind and limb. Most Company officers can tell you of instances of the sort when men of proved courage have lagged unaccountably at the last moment of going over, their muscles cramped and palsied by a veritable passion of physical fear.

No one denies the fascination of danger for any mind which is not utterly debauched by the blind pursuit of peace and security: there is even a kind of monstrous perverted luxury in the agonies of the whole-hearted coward. But that spice of danger which gives a tang to all genuine forms of sport is a very different thing from the ghastly hazards of war, and especially of modern war, and I refuse to believe in the existence of the soldier who "loves danger for its own sake," and is said never to have known fear. Such a being should be either much more or much less than a man. One has met men to whom, on a superficial acquaintance, one might feel inclined to attribute such inhuman qualities. But I believe that in every case it was either their simple sense of duty, their sportsmanship, or their fine mastery over themselves, that gave them that semblance of insensibility which was, in fact, so much more noble than what it passed for.

But not all have the same moral thews: and I believe that the mental attitude of the mass is something of this sort. They do their duty because it is their duty, and because it is besides supported by very clearly apprehended sanctions. It is a dangerous duty, and they know it; but they are saved from unprofitable reference to this fact by their continuous association with others who are in like case, and by the professional automatism which the trade of war, like any other trade, develops in those who follow it. They are sustained too by a crude kind of fatalism: "If there's a shell with my name on it, it'll get me whatever I do: and if there isn't, it doesn't matter what I do."

Cowardice in a soldier should be the supreme incongruity; as if one were to speak of a blind painter or a dumb orator.

It is the unpardonable sin; and the penalty, the irrevocable punishment of death, is adjudged to fit the crime.

Many, especially in the New Army, were altogether opposed to the death sentence. They would have substituted imprisonment or penal employment outside the battle area. Others pointed out that this would constitute a grave injustice to those who stuck by their duty, and would, besides, be a direct incitement to desertion. The more so, as during the War sentences of imprisonment were almost invariably suspended, with every prospect of an amnesty at the end. A third party argued, with much relevance, that deserters should be returned to the line and special provision made for retaining them there. Such treatment would also give a man a chance of redeeming his past weakness.

I am not concerned, however, with the abstract question. It has fallen to my lot to see a brave man die the death appointed for cowards; and if I helped him to meet his end with fortitude, at least I was well paid for it by the lesson of quiet courage which he taught me in return.

My battalion was out of the line when the Senior Chaplain called at my billet one evening to tell me that a man, belonging to another Brigade of my Division, was to be shot next morning for desertion, and that he had asked for a priest. Nothing was further from my thoughts at the time: it was a possibility that I had sometimes envisaged but had never really expected to encounter: and when the summons came, I was conscious of a thrill of repugnance.

I found the condemned man in an improvised cell at the A.P.M.'s quarters. He was sitting in a corner, his head bowed on his manacled hands, holding a wretched rag of a handkerchief to his eyes. He was sobbing brokenly, and I confess that the words which had vaguely occurred to me as I hurried along, died upon my lips. There was nothing that one could say, just then, which would not have sounded intolerably trivial and intrusive in face of such desolate misery; and for a long time I sat silent beside him, the witness of an anguish as mortal as death itself. I kept my eyes on the ground and waited, knowing that before long the absolute necessity of human sympathy would force him into speech.

To die among the roar and in the shock and fury of battle is a thing that many men had come hardly to fear, and others almost to desire: but how frightful to be led out, blindfold

and bound, in the chill of the morning, and there be silently put to death—the very phrase is a strangling horror in itself.

When at last he spoke it was in a perfectly dry and steady voice:

"You a priest?"

"Yes."

"I want to go to Confession."

Half an hour later I gave him Communion. The law of fasting had been suspended for the troops at the Front. He remained for a long time afterwards on his knees: then, after a big Sign of the Cross, he went to the bucket of water that stood by the wall, washed and dried his face, and sitting down beside me, began to tell me the story of his disaster.

He was a native of one of the bi-lingual Dominions of the Empire. He was in England when the war broke out and had joined up at once. He was drafted into a Highland regiment than which, perhaps, no society could have been more uncongenial to a man of his origin and temperament. Rightly or wrongly, he believed that his comrades laughed at and made a butt of him, chiefly on account of his noticeably foreign accent and unfamiliar ways. He seemed to be rather exceptionally sensitive, and his dread of incurring further ridicule by making mistakes in speech, made him awkward and unready in repartee. He had really had nothing worse to bear than the usual rather unequivocal banter and artless personalities which form the staple of social intercourse in the ranks, but he bore it badly. English was only his second language: and it is a fact that the essential difference between languages resides not in their verbal dissimilarities alone, but also in the widely different connotations of otherwise equivalent terms, so that words which in two languages bear precisely the same literal meaning may often, especially in a tropical sense, have quite contrary implications.

Anyhow, he was soon profoundly unhappy, and his one desire, which rapidly became an obsession, was to join the French Army, in which he believed that he would find himself at home. There were insuperable technical difficulties in the way of a legalized transfer, so he madly resolved to take the matter into his own hands. He deserted, I understood, from a rest camp: was arrested and sentenced to a term of imprisonment which was, as usual, suspended for the duration of the war: and a little later, under much the

same circumstances, he deserted again. He was once more arrested and his sentence repeated. Then he did the unpardonable thing. He deserted from the line, "in face of the enemy." Not, I am convinced, from cowardice, for his whole record showed that he was no coward: but still under the impulse of his unfortunate obsession. And when after many weeks he was recaptured, he was found living in a village, wearing civilian clothes. I suppose that nothing could have saved him then. In estimating such a case one has to think soldier-wise, not as a county-court lawyer. One has to remember, too, the well-known scrupulosity of the Commander-in-Chief in all that concerned the death penalty, and the anxious consideration to which he submitted each case before confirmation.

The man himself, at any rate, had no illusions on the subject. His one complaint, on which however he did not seem to insist, for though he mentioned it at the beginning of our conversation he never referred to it again, was that some at least of the witnesses against him had been prejudiced.

"I done it," he said, the poor fellow; "but they'd no call to say the things they did."

On my way down from my billet I had called at the E.F.C. and bought some chocolate, cigarettes, candied fruits, and other things such as I knew the men loved, and these I now laid out on the table. He was very moderate. He smoked three or four cigarettes and now and then helped himself to a chocolate or one of the other sweets, and he would only take the veriest sip of whisky from my flask. The sergeant of police looked in from time to time, and at my request removed his handcuffs. Eventually, on the invitation of the prisoner, he joined us round the fire, and we sat for a long time exchanging reminiscences of our service. The condemned man spoke without the least restraint and with no reference at all to his dreadful circumstances. Only once, after describing a narrow escape that he had had from a shell, in the line before Le Sars, he said, "I sure thought it'd got me": then, with a wry smile, after a pause, "Perhaps it was better if it had, eh?"

He spoke of himself with a curious detachment, as of one who had lived long ago. After the intimate revelations of himself of which I had been the recipient, I understood him well enough to know that this was neither artificial nor the result of natural obtuseness. He had faced, and after the

first great agony had fought down, the terror that confronted him. He had received the Sacraments that gave peace and security to his soul, and he was man enough to make little after that of the swift death that awaited his body. The impression that he made upon me was of a man who looked upon himself as no longer of the world of living men: I thought that in the intervals of silence I detected on his face an absent, tense, almost impatient expression, such as a man might wear who is trying to catch a faint, far-away sound.

It was after midnight when at last he consented to lie down, twining his rosary round his wrist. I had a bed beside his. Whether he slept or not I cannot say, but he never moved once all through the night.

Shortly after five I called him.

He was to die at six o'clock.

He dressed in silence, but without the smallest sign of agitation. I remember how careful he was about the adjustment of his puttees. He then renewed his confession and received Communion once more.

After his breakfast he smoked a cigarette but refused all stimulant, and we remained talking quietly together until the sergeant, as had been arranged, put in his head to warn us that the time was drawing near. He then handed me a letter for his wife, and asked me particularly to remember that to the best of his belief he had no debts, and that he bore no grudge to anyone. I knew to what he referred.

A few minutes more and the door opened to admit the A.P.M., accompanied by a medical officer, the prisoner's own Company Sergeant-Major, and three military police. The prisoner came at once to attention and saluted the officers. The Sergeant-Major then formally identified him: the policemen tied a bandage over his eyes and fastened his hands behind him: and the medical officer pinned a small square of lint over his heart, to serve as a mark for the firing party.

Then, with the A.P.M. leading, we went out.

The place of execution was only a few yards away: three sides of a square, solidly built of sandbags, and in the centre a stout post. I kept my hand upon his arm as we walked, and I can vouch for it that he never faltered nor trembled.

Arrived within the square he was bound securely to the post, and I had time to hear him make his act of contrition and give him Absolution once more, to put the crucifix to

his steady lips, to press his hand in good-bye, and to get "God bless you, Father," from him, before the A.P.M. motioned to me to stand aside.

It was a misty morning, and the white fog magnified the sounds that rose from the just-awakened camps about us. Some trucks clanked noisily on a siding below, and there was a stamping of horses and a rattle of chains from the standings across the road above us. Shouts and whistles and the thousand confused rumours of a busy camp reached us, and in the distance a mellow baritone voice was singing "The Roses of Picardy."

With these familiar sounds of everyday life in his ears and the bite of the sharp morning air on his face, in full health and strength and youth, he died.

At a sign from the A.P.M. the firing party, which up till then had stood with their backs to the condemned man, faced about to him: at a second sign they took aim: at a third they fired, and the bound figure crumpled and slid down as far as the ropes would let him go.

Instantly the officer in command called his men to attention, formed fours, and marched them off; and the medical officer, stepping forward to examine the body, reported five bullets through the heart.

The cemetery lay a few hundred yards away; and in less than a quarter of an hour from the time that the dead man and I had sat talking together in the hut, the earth had been pressed down over him in his grave, and I was signing the label for the identifying peg at its head.

That, and a pool of bright red blood steaming in the hollow of the stretcher, was all the trace that he had left.

He had paid the just penalty of his offence: but I ask no better than that I may meet my death, when I must, as gallantly as did that Deserter.

R. H. J. STEUART.

HENRY VIII. AND ST. THOMAS BECKET¹

II. SOURCES OF ERROR CONCERNING THE KING'S SACRILEGE.

THE story of the destruction of St. Thomas's Shrine and the burning of his remains, studied by itself, with proper attention to the sequence of events, stands out so clear and coherent that one feels at some loss to explain the suspicion, and even unbelief, with which it has been, and is still sometimes regarded. The state of chaos in which the historical materials used to lie no doubt explains much; for it made one inclined to doubt anyone who professed to be certain about anything connected with that period. And there are other reasons a little more below the surface. The change of religion also accounts for something; but on the other hand the first and highest authorities, as well Catholic as Protestant, are here at one.

Another stumbling block has been our English trust in formal records, authoritative accounts, in a word, in officialism. Though that tendency is a good one, it always needs moderating. And certainly it would be a mistake to trust blindly to officialism during the years when Henry was suppressing all criticism by force. Unfortunately, however, this was done by Bishop Burnet, and from his time (1679) till ours, Henry's official apologists have never been without some followers. The first source of error concerning the desecration of the Shrine which we have to consider will therefore be

THE OFFICIAL EXCUSE.

The English envoy, Thomas Knight, writing from Valencia in Spain, only three weeks after the "disgarnishing," says that he has been questioned by the Spaniards about the Saint of Canterbury, but "Mr. Wriothesley, who played a part in that play, had before *sufficiently instructed me how to answer* such questions." Soon after this, Wriothesley himself reports that, an occasion being offered, he had "*declared*

¹ See THE MONTH, February, "Henry VIII. and St. Thomas Becket."

the abuses of Canterbury." So there were official excuses from the beginning.

What they were we learn from the Windsor herald, Charles Wriothesley, a contemporary chronicler. He says that at the disgarnishing, "they found (St. Thomas's) head whole with the bones, which had a wound in the skull. But the monks had enclosed another skull in silver richly, for the people to offer to, which they said was St. Thomas's skull. So that now *the abuse* was openly known."

A slightly different account of the same "abuse" was given by Thomas Derby in an official *apologia* put forth next year. My readers will easily understand that any *apologia* put forth by Henry for his crimes at this period is not likely to be an honourable one. The Calendarer frankly calls Derby's production "a dishonest document." This, however, is what Derby says about the "abuses of Canterbury":

Forasmuch as his head, *almost whole*, was found with the rest of the bones, closed within the shrine, and that there was in that church the great skull of another head (but much greater by the threequarter parts than that part which was lacking in the head enclosed within the shrine)—hereby it appeared that the same was but a feigned fiction. If this head was brent, was therefore S. Thomas brent? Assuredly it concludeth not.

We have yet another account, but in date later than the Terror, and the writer is now "honest John Stow." Using a description of the Shrine, which, as we have seen before, goes back to the time of the "disgarnishing," Stow wrote:

The chest of iron contained the bones of Thomas Becket, skull and all, with the wound of his death, and the piece cut out of his skull laid in the same wound. These bones by commandment of the Lord Cromwell were then and there burnt.

If we attend to our honest chronicler first, we shall soon see the inner meaning of two earlier writers. When the chest was opened, the wounded skull was found. Then from the reliquary called "The head of St. Thomas," the piece of skull venerated by the people, was taken out "and laid in the same wound." This, however, would have been impossible unless "the piece" fitted the hole, or was somewhat smaller. From this it at once follows that the stories, told by Thomas Derby or copied by Wriothesley, are official excuses of a dishonest character. They say that the relic in the

head-reliquary was either a complete head, as Wriothesley's account suggests; or a bone nearly twice as large as the hole in the skull (as Derby says with more show of moderation, but presumably with even greater malice). Derby's elusive question, too, at the end, "If this head was brent, was therefore S. Thomas brent?" forms again an instructive contrast to Stow's frank assertion, "These bones [*i.e.*, skull and all] were then and there burnt by the commandment of the Lord Cromwell."

William Thomas, the last apologist we have to quote, has less claim on our belief than any of the above. He was a Protestant extremist, who eventually became tutor to Edward VI., and was finally executed by Mary. For the Queen's justification it will suffice here to refer to *D.N.B.* It is more important for us to ask if he ever had any connection at this time with the Court or with Canterbury. Nothing seems to have yet appeared on this subject.

All that we know is that he left England in 1542, and Mr. Froude thinks that he did so because he was already an advanced Protestant. He went to Italy, for Italian was of great value in those days for the teaching profession, and there, after Henry's death, he wrote in Italian a dialogue in defence of the King. He represents himself as discussing with his interrogator the subject of "our S. Thomas of Canterbury, whose spoiled shrine and burned bones seemeth so greatly to offend your conscience." Then he starts his apology, saying that the King found that alleged miracles worked at St. Thomas's Well were "utterly false."

So the king, moved of necessity, could do no less than deface the shrine that was author of so much idolatry. Whether the doing thereof hath been the undoing of a canonised saint or not, I cannot tell. But this is true that the bones are spread amongst the bones of so many dead men, that without some great miracle, they will not be found again.

Whether or not Thomas knew anything about the Shrine, at least he tells us nothing. Like the other apologists, he merely gives the "go by" to the charge which he has quoted, neither affirming nor denying the burning. He appears to have forgotten, or rather never to have heard of, the "abuse" mentioned by Wriothesley and Derby. He allows the King the right to rob, and suppress shrines, at will, and the only excuse he can allege is the shallow Protestant allegation that

the veneration of relics leads to "idolatry." The statement about the Saint's bones being spread among the bones of other dead men may be nothing more than a mocking repetition of the Pope's allegation that Henry threw the ashes of the bones to the four winds.

If the reader does not feel inclined to follow me in all these conclusions, there is really no reason why I should press him to do so. It is sufficient if he recognize that Thomas's evidence is at all events of inferior value to that of our great chroniclers.

DR. MASON'S THEORY AND MODERN CRITICISM.

Modern critical history does not tell a different story from that of the early chroniclers. James Gairdner, H. A. L. Fisher, and A. F. Pollard, all speak for the burning of the bones as Froude and Dixon did before. There is no doubt where the weight of historical opinion lies, though the voice of dissent is not silenced, and we must not expect that it will be. Some antiquarians will always be able to find convenient pegs on which to hang opposite theories.

Dr. Mason¹ is a student of this class. Erudite and diligent though he certainly is, he has also proved too true a disciple of Burnet in his respect for Derby and Thomas. His theory is that the bones were really buried, but he imagines that a popular report of their being burnt spread at once over England, as it also, he thinks, spread over the Continent. In England this alleged popular report was adopted by all the chroniclers, and abroad by the Pope and the Catholics in general. Thus the whole world is conceived to be rumoured, and wrong. The only people to be trusted are Henry's official apologists (pp. 137, 148). *A priori*, there may be nothing intrinsically absurd in such a fancy, and Dr. Mason of course states it as plausibly as possible. Still, there is nothing in it to call for a reconsideration of the conclusion we have just arrived at, historically certain as we have shown it to be. The theory is, after all, mere conjecture, the evidence being uniformly against it. It will be better worth our while to turn to what Dr. Mason says about Pope Paul III.

We ought not to take it in bad part that Dr. Mason has a good word to say of "bluff King Hal," who is after all the titular founder of Dr. Mason's canonry. At all events,

¹ *What Became of the Bones of St. Thomas?* By A. J. Mason, D.D., Canon of Canterbury. Cambridge University Press. 1920.

he dignifies the King's insolent proceedings against the Saint with the name of "a scientific investigation," and is clearly pained that the Pope took a different view, as he thinks "in angry credulity." Paul had said ironically that Henry had caused the Saint "to be summoned into judgment"—*in iudicium vocari fecit*. Dr. Mason, however, translates differently. He declares the Pope must mean that Henry sent "a summons [to the Saint] to appear in court and to stand trial" (p. 170). Similarly, where the Pope goes on *tanquam contumacem damnari*, our translator has it that the Saint "failed to appear when summoned, and was guilty of contempt of court" (p. 133 n.). One may concede, that if the Pope had used those English words or their full equivalents, then he would have been relying on some source different from Henry's own words in his proclamation.

But Dr. Mason's method of translation will not stand examination. He simply strains each word in turn, as far as he can, without reason or method. Reason surely tells us that the right procedure is to take Henry's words first, and to see if Paul's words, taken literally and fairly, correspond with them. They do. Henry spoke of proofs, of the advice of his Council, of a sentence on the Saint. The words *in iudicium vocari fecit* correspond quite well with that. Dr. Mason is mistaken in saying that Paul speaks of a "sham trial" (p. 134): that word "sham" is neither used nor hinted at in the Bull. The next clause, too, that Henry caused Thomas *tanquam contumacem damnari*, correspond quite intelligibly with Henry's long screed on the Saint's continued resistance to the demands of the then King, and as so resisting is not infelicitously described as *contumax*.

Thus the Pope's words correspond quite naturally with those of Henry, and if Dr. Mason had printed Henry first and Paul next, as of course he should have done, one would have thought that he would at once have seen their mutual relation. But he has unfortunately printed them in inverse order, which may perhaps account for the slight confusion and exaggeration in his ideas. In so far as the question is one of classical latinity, I have no serious objection to make.

Paul treated Henry with greater statesmanship and respect than did other writers of note on the Catholic side. Dr. Mason cites the words of Pole and of Dr. Sander on the same proclamation; they dwell almost exclusively on Henry's mere tyranny, and there is very much indeed to be said for

that view. But the Pope takes a more judicial line, and makes more allowances, for he admits that the King's act may have been considered, and even legal in form. Dr. Mason should rather have praised than blamed him for so doing.

THE FORGERIES OF DON CRISOSTOMO HENRIQUEZ, 1626.

The last source of error which we have to notice arose some eighty-eight years after the tragedy of the desecration, and the person concerned is now a Catholic, and, indeed, a Cistercian monk. I shall have in due time some possible excuses to make for him, but in any case the truth, ugly though it be, must not be hidden, that this monk, by a forgery intended to glorify the Saint, has perniciously weakened his Patron's cause, and allowed the robber King to escape much of the blame that was his due.

The history of those eighty-eight years is for our purposes soon told. The Bull of Excommunication against Henry was never published. The jealousies of France and Spain, though it once seemed as though they might be tided over, proved after all too strong for any concerted action against the revolutionary Tudor, and without such concert the Bull could not be executed. The English court indeed learned that a Bull had been composed, but they never saw a copy; nor perhaps did any other court. Not one copy of it has yet been described or published as existing in any archives here or abroad. Consequently, both Lingard and Canon Dixon came to the conclusion that the Bull was never published, and Dr. Mason himself acknowledges this. Its text seems to have been unknown to the great English controversialists at Louvain, as also to the diligent Dr. Sander, though he knew the proclamation.¹ Under these circumstances it seems especially feeble in Dr. Mason to endeavour to weaken the testimony of Harpsfield and Cope, by saying (pp. 132, 137) that the Bull gave a *mot d'ordre*, which Catholic writers had to follow.

After lying *perdu* for fifty years, the Bull was revived as an historical document by Ludovico Cherubini in the first edition of the Roman *Bullarium*, Rome, 1586, 1587, a copy of which is at the British Museum. It is to this source that all our known copies may be traced, the earliest of these

¹ This is clear because Sander does not mention the burning of the bones, which is in the Bull, but does mention the punishment for honouring the Saint, which is in the proclamation only.

being inserted by Father Robert Persons in his edition of Sander, *De Schismate Anglicano*, also at Rome, in 1586.

Persons also enlarged Sander with various citations from authors in print or MS., then in the library of the English College, Rome, and amongst others from Nicholas Hilliard, secretary to Bishop Tunstal, whom he calls Eliardus. Persons's books went through many editions and translations, amongst which we shall have to pay special attention to the Italian version of Fra Girolamo Pollini, O.P., in 1594, whose original MS. is in the Barberini Collection, now incorporated in the Vatican Library.

Thirty-two years later still the Dominican was made use of by Don Crisostomo, a hagiographer most earnest in publishing the great deeds of his Order in a popular form. That sort of work does not always lead to high ideals of historical scholarship, any more than the use of rococco ornamentation leads to the formation of high class decorative art. While such writers are generally quite honest, it must also be confessed that low critical standards and wrong ideals have led sometimes to blameworthy excesses among Spanish writers of this class and period. The Trinitarians, for instance, published histories of their ancient English convents by Gonzalez de Avila, by Figueras, and by Lopez de Altuna, in 1630, 1645, 1714, which contain not only many incredible miracles, but in the latter case, even whole bibliographies which are purely fictitious.¹

The existence then of *romanceros* among Spanish hagiographers of this period is not to be lost sight of, but we need not condemn Don Crisostomo as a "novelist." His stumbling block presumably lay in a mistaken zeal for imitating a well-known device of Tacitus and Thucydides, who enliven their accounts of a policy or a measure by quoting, as it were, the very speech of the historical character responsible for it. The pious eulogist was apt to think himself free to follow and even to improve on this practice, by composing letters and the like, to bring out the points already in the authorities before him.

It was probably in some such spirit as this that Don Crisostomo Henriquez sat down to write his *Phoenix Reviviscens*, 1626, in which he describes the burning of the bones. I do not wish to speak here too dogmatically. There certainly have been forgeries, and the monk has fathered them.

¹ For some further authorities reference may be made to THE MONTH, June, 1895, "Spurious Records of Tudor Martyrs," by the present writer.

Still, *it may be*, as Dr. Mason says (p. 170), that some one else wrote them before. I admit the possibility, and I do not wish to exclude it later on, though I speak in the ordinary way of a writer as responsible for the story he publishes, when he gives no indication that he is not the author.

Henriquez had before him Pollini's story, in substance exactly the same as that of Sander, but amplified in translation to eight or ten lines. Henriquez enlarged this to thirteen pages, and while he professed to follow Pollini, he really left him entirely, except for the first and penultimate sections.

§ 1. In the first sentences he introduces from Pollini the general subject of destruction of Shrines. § 2. Then Henry confers with Cromwell, what they shall do against St. Thomas. Cromwell suggests a trial before the Council. § 3. So a summons (printed in full) is issued against him, dated, London 24 April 1536. § 4. And after trial sentence is pronounced (printed in full), dated, London 11 June 1538. § 5. Henry orders on the 11th of August the sentence to be executed, and on the 19th (St. Bernard's Day) the bones are burnt. § 6. St. Thomas in heaven puts off punishment. § 7. The King of France is angry and breaks off his alliance with Henry. § 8. Even the German Lutherans detest the crime. § 9. The Pope excommunicates. § 10. When dying Henry was heard to say, "Oh Thomas, thou art well revenged!" (thus fulfilling § 6).

On the general character of the story it is not necessary to comment. None of the incidents alleged (except the first and ninth taken from Pollini) is specifically heard of elsewhere, and the statement about the thoughts of St. Thomas in Heaven, which the writer claims to know in § 6, and to recount as accomplished in § 10, are suspicious to the point of being indefensible. But the most obvious way of detecting a forger's handicraft is generally found to lie in his chronology and other small points where accuracy is required. The argument from them is here overwhelming.

We remember that the Pope, in perfect good faith, made a grave error in the chronology of Henry's actions. He very naturally but erroneously put the sentence on St. Thomas (November 16th) before the burning (early September). This mistake was *not repeated* by Sander (or Pollini), for Sander had Henry's proclamation before him. Henriquez, on the other hand, copies the papal error, and distorts it into absurd proportions. He knew that the date of the excommunication was December 17th, but he had no date for the desecration. So (knowing that ample time is always taken

over papal judgments) he took four months before the Bull, which brought him to August 17th, three days before the Feast of St. Bernard, the founder of his Order. Probably thinking that the desecration of that day would add a new element of horror among the friends of the Order for whom he wrote, he fixed on that feast for his date, but oddly enough, made a mistake in the day, calling it the 19th for the 20th.

Yet at this time (so elaborately fixed by the feast as well as the day number) the Shrine was standing in all its glory, as we know through Madame de Montreuil's visit, the destruction coming just a fortnight later!

After fixing the desecration, Henriquez's next object was to date the so-called trial. Here again he had no help from Pollini, though that writer had put 1536 in his margin as a *terminus a quo* for his whole chapter. So taking 1536 for his year, he added (without rhyme or reason that I can see) the day April 24th, and he affirmed that on that day Henry issued the summons to trial. He wishes us, therefore, to believe that this summons was issued by the highest court in England and handed to the Saint of Canterbury with due legal formality. He does not specify the means, but presumably he means that it was laid or hung on the tomb, or at least proclaimed to its guardians. If so, it would go without saying that they and all the *dévots* of St. Thomas would have been shocked and astounded at such an event.

And yet for the *two and a half* years still to run before the desecration, though we have a fairly copious correspondence from Canterbury in those days, no word of so astonishing an event!

Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of pilgrims flocked almost daily around the tomb—and still no news got abroad of the marvel that is said to have met their eyes or ears, though the real outrage was noised all over Europe in six weeks.

Soberly considered, this is the climax of Henriquez's inventions.¹ It is impossible to question that he was roman-cing without any regard to facts. That he dates the sentence June 11th, when we know it was really November 16th, may seem by contrast almost a venial offence, though it is further aggravated by being placed before instead of after

¹ This mistake would have attracted more notice, had not Wilkins in his reprint changed the figure 1536 to 1538. From various small indications I fancy that Wilkins had not access to the original printed book, but used a transcript. He may therefore have thought the date 1536 a mere slip, to be corrected in silence. But when one sees that it is *carefully copied from Pollini*, its dark import must not be overlooked.

the desecration, as has been seen before. A further tell-tale inaccuracy is our writer's use of Henry's titles. In 1626, the English royal titles included that of King of Ireland, and Henriquez regularly employs it in the writs he has composed for the year 1538. But this is an anachronism, for the title was in fact only assumed in 1540. Another inaccuracy is in the place name. Not only is Londonium an erroneous form for Londinium, but this town-name is mentioned without any further specification. Yet, then as now, nobody, much less a king, dated from London, *simpliciter*: there was always the additional name of a street, a palace, or other *locus loci*. The writer of Henriquez's writs, on the contrary, apparently inhabited some small country place, where everyone knew everyone else, so that it was sufficient to name the locality and no more.

With these clear blunders before us there can be no question that Henriquez was romancing freely: yet I would repeat my opinion that in all his thirteen pages he seems to draw on no other historical source than Pollini. His two writs, for instance, contain no new facts beyond those of the Italian Dominican. The feigned interview between Henry and Cromwell in § 2, is indeed entirely imaginative, but the persons and characters are from the *Istoria*, and the same thing is true of the remaining sections. Scandalous though it be to put forth such things in the name of history, these fabrications are thus not purely malicious, not inconsistent with certain pleas for mitigation of sentence.

If what I have described as a literary mannerism of Tacitus and others be defended by any people as worthy of history in the highest sense, they, I think, should not proceed to extremities against Henriquez. But those who prefer facts, however ugly, to fiction, however suave (and who in his senses does not?), will reject that ground of excuse without a moment's wavering. They may also well enough point to the sequel of Henriquez's fable, as strongly confirming their decision. For what has more helped to confuse the plain story of Henry's guilt, and to conceal the outrage done to St. Thomas, than the dishonesty of the Saint's most prolific defender? Indeed, I think that even the aberrations of Dr. Mason should really be traced back to the *ignis fatuus* kindled by the Spanish monk. *Ne faciamus mala, ut veniant bona.*

J. H. POLLEN.

IN SAINT AUGUSTINE'S DIOCESE

I.

AT home we should probably, as Herbert says, be having fog and electric light for breakfast, but here at Hammam Meskoutine, in mid-December, Toto carries our table to the shadiest corner of the terrace.

Hammam, of course, means *bath*, and *meskoutine* means *damned*. I am sorry for this language, which is certainly the last I should choose personally to describe a place like this, where, without paying five francs, and grovelling at the feet of indescribably superior chambermaids, or waiting long patient hours, ending in tepid disappointment, one can get a boiling hot bath at any moment of the day or night. It was idiotic of Herbert to refuse at first to come here.

"These hydro-places are all alike," he said. "They all smell of rotten eggs. Besides, the guide-book says the chief attraction of this Hammam Meskoutine of yours is its fields of savage onions, and all I have to say is that that is not what I came out to Algeria to see."

Some men, when they take it into their heads, can be so utterly unreasonable that it would have been mere waste of time to point out that *oignons* means bulbs, and, in this case, iris bulbs, dwarf irises, purple ones, sheets of them spread like a royal carpet along the valleys. It was the irises, in fact, and not the baths, I came here for. We were at Biskra, and I was tired to death of that Hichens-town, and its harsh brown walls, and the sand and the touts and the snarling camels trooping in from the desert with dates. It was one sleepless night, when the moonlight poured in through the window, and lit up the sandy garden, and the eternal palm-trees, and the dogs were howling behind the cactus-hedges that I read about Hammam Meskoutine, and the mere idea of green grass and purple flowers seemed so *kind* after the harsh crudities of Biskra, and the awful severity of the desert. Herbert said it was exceedingly *banale* of me to want to leave the desert for a hydro, but I just challenged him to mention any spot on earth more *banale* than Biskra (seeing that, thanks to Mr. Hichens, it is to Algeria what Margate is to England) and departed.

"We meet then at Tunis," said Herbert—but we met here,

as it happened. Herbert turned up last night, well-punished for having sneered at me and my hydro.

It appears that after I had left, he suddenly got tired of Biskra, and set off on a motor-tour, through Kabylia, to Bougie on the coast (where the candles get their French name from) with our friends the Boleyns, Mr. and Mrs. and Miss. Somewhere among the Djurdjura Mountains their car broke down, and they found themselves, just before sunset, stranded on the ledge of a precipice, with another precipice (swarming with vultures) yawning over their heads, mountain-tops blocking the sky-line in all directions, and nothing more consoling in sight than a forbidding-looking Arab village in the distance. The Boleyns rose to the occasion. Madame unstrapped her tea-basket, and remarked weightily that there was nothing on these occasions like a nice hot cup of tea; Miss Lily produced milk-chocolate and Marie biscuits; and her father kept up the spirits and improved the minds of the party by reading a description of their surroundings on a loud and cheerful note.

Eagles, vultures, monkeys, jackals, lions, panthers and other wild animals abound in these lonely spots, but it is now four years since a lion descended from the mountains and devoured the station-master's little daughter at Beni So-and-so.

This piece of information, Herbert says, was received in silence. Then Miss Lily remarked casually that no doubt the book had been compiled a good many years ago. Everyone cordially supported this theory, and then darkness fell, quite suddenly, as it does here in Algeria, and Herbert thought, as he told me later, how nice it would be in my hydro even without the iris fields. It all sounded so cosy—and so safe.

Finally the chauffeur emerged from his long retreat underneath the car, and announced that with luck they might push on towards Bougie without a further mishap. They set off cautiously, and arrived at length at Bougie at an unearthly hour, and the next morning Herbert set out—by train—and, now he is here he is determined to stay, though we are due this week to meet friends at Tunis.

He intends to stay here, he says even if it is necessary to develop anthrax as an excuse. I agree that it would be well worth while to have anthrax (whatever it is—Herbert doesn't know, but he says it's awfully catching, and they wouldn't

want us at Tunis anyway). I agree because, if you want to understand anything at all about Algeria, this is the place to be in. And if you are a Catholic, it makes all the difference if you understand.

I arrived alone, as you know, and late in the evening. I was too tired (no one who does not know the Algerian railways can imagine how tired) to notice anything about the place, when I drove by moonlight down the long ilex-avenue which takes you from the station to the hotel. All I wanted was bed, and a glass of iced water. You can't think how much I had been looking forward to that glass of water, for I knew that in a place like this the water would be wholesome, and I was tired to death of Vichy and that fiery red Algerian wine, which may be very good, but somehow it makes one so irritable and thirsty. So all I asked for when they showed me my room was hot water to wash in and cold water to drink.

The hot water (gallons of it) appeared like magic, but if you think I could get that cold water to drink!

"I regret extremely, Monsieur," said the valet-de-chambre, "but it appears that the supply of water put down this evening to cool has been exhausted."

I didn't grasp at once what he meant.

"Monsieur did not remark, in coming from the station, the vapour from our hot springs?"

As a matter of fact I had noticed something which, to my poor Londoner's eyes, seemed only too familiar. I had thought it was fog—and I remember I felt it was rather disappointing of Algeria, seeing that fog was the one thing of all others I had crossed the Mediterranean to avoid. But it was not fog. It was the never-ceasing vapour rising from the springs the Arab call Hammam Meskoutine.

I never got that cold water, but while I was unpacking there came a knock at the door, and Toto reappeared, followed by an English setter and a blind cat, and bringing me some coffee. I had not ordered it. As a matter of fact I was feeling so cross and tired that I said to myself if I couldn't have that glass of cold water I wouldn't have anything. I also considered it very bad management, and exceedingly unfair that in a hot place like this the water should be hot, and that hot springs should not have been provided in cold countries like England. But Toto, out of the kindness of his heart, had brought me this coffee. Toto

is a Kabyle. That is why he is such a dear. Kabyles, you know, are not Arabs, and they are only "sort-of" Mohammedans. They are Berbers, born and bred here in North African countries before the Arabs invaded it. St. Augustine was a Berber, and this place was in his diocese—the diocese of Constantine and Hippo, they call it now. I told this to a little Anglican clergyman we met at the Hôtel Cirta, at Constantine, and he said it was indeed an interesting thought, adding immediately afterwards that time brought changes, and that at present the Anglican Bishop of Gibraltar had a more extensive diocese than Augustine.

"Rome," he remarked pleasantly, "is in his diocese." I thought of this and laughed to myself while I was drinking the coffee that kind Toto brought me. It was excellent (everything is, in this hotel), and when I had finished it I did not feel cross or tired any longer, and instead of going to bed I slipped on a dressing-gown, and opened the long windows of this little whitewashed room which Toto's French wife keeps as exquisitely as a nun's cell, and stepped out on to the terrace.

II.

Every place seems to have two faces, don't you think—or perhaps one real face, and a mask. The mask, of course, is for the day-time, for isn't it true, as someone says, that the day is a screen, crowded with accidents, which obscures the substance behind, so that, in the vulgar tongue, you can't see the wood for the trees? But at night the screen is rolled up. The accidents—most of them at least—disappear, and the substance underneath them is revealed. That is why day and night tell a different story, especially in Algeria. And this is what it amounts to: by day Algeria is what we call the East ("the magic of the East three days' journey from London," the travel-bureaux call it), and its accidents are Mohammedan. But by night it is Western, and Christian. In fact, *Europa Irredenta*, as Mr. Chesterton would say.

A friend of ours was talking about this last night when we were down by the railway watching for porcupines.

"People, when they come out to Algeria," he said, "get up facts in guide-books, and bring out *The Garden of Allah*, and then they think they have sized things up. But they are right off the track. See here!"

He produced pencil and paper, and handed them to me.

"You are going to draw a map," he said.

"I couldn't," I said, "to save my life."

"Oh yes, you can. This map is different. It's not a land-map. It's a sea-map. Only the vulgar think maps must be land-ones. Now look here. Draw an oval, like a long egg. That's it. Now write the name in the middle—the Mediterranean. Now put in all the places you can remember on the coasts, beginning with Marseilles, and going all the way round. All the way. You see the point? The Mediterranean unites all these places, instead of dividing them. They are like deer all going down to drink of the waters of the same lake. They belong to the same family—the family they used to call the Roman Empire. Then, too, the Roman Church. You've got St. Augustine over on this side, and St. Cyprian, and those martyrs over at Carthage—SS. Felicitas and Perpetua."

All this was nothing new, of course. Everyone knows it, and yet people—silly people, naturally, the kind one meets anywhere, but really here they seem to swarm—talk as if Algeria were the birthright of the Arabs ("such handsome men, my dear, and so dignified!") and the French were greedy interlopers. You hear that sort of thing at Timgad and Lambessa, under the very shadow of Roman ruins, as magnificent as any the world can show—glorious witnesses to the fact that it is the Arabs who are the interlopers. Why, somewhere in the second century Roman Africa gave a Pope—Victor his name was—to the Church, ages before Mohammed was born or ever thought of . . .

But then, of course, some people will say anything. Our little Anglican friend went to Timgad with us, and as we walked up the hill to that superb ruined city, he remarked in the most innocent manner in the world:

"Dear me, dear me, how this brings one home to be sure. It might be our cemetery at Blackburn ahead. There's just the same steep approach, and the monuments standing up against the sky-line!"

Perhaps it was the shades of the Donatists which made our Anglican friend remark, as he often did, that Algeria was "like home"! I agree with him, you know, all the same. But to me the feeling only comes at night; and there was one place where it would not come at all, and that was Biskra. There the sensation of being *in partibus infidelium*

was so strong that it used to drive me at all sorts of odd times to seek refuge in the little French church behind the mimosas in the sun-bitten square.

Our friend of the sea-map shares my feeling that Biskra (he is writing a book on Algeria filled with *loud silence* about Biskra) and he understands perfectly what it meant to me to find myself here on the terrace that first night.

The moon was up, and the stars were out, and it was almost as bright as day, but whether the light was azure or pale primrose I could not quite decide. The stone terrace, which was very broad, ran under the windows of the one-storied white-walled hydro, built round two sides of a square planted with orange-trees. The cool, gentle air was fresh with the keen and delicate scent of narcissi which run like a ribbon in a narrow bed underneath the terrace. Dark ilex-groves rose behind the white walls, and further behind still was the cloud of vapour from the Enchanted Baths.

The silence was cloister-deep, and it came into my head that the scene looked, if you know what I mean, like a picture of Compline.

III.

As soon as Herbert arrived yesterday he insisted on being taken to see the fields of purple iris. Our friend of the sea-map says they are nothing to be compared with the sight here in March when the whole landscape is covered with a flowery robe of gold and crimson, purple and blue, and he hurried us, in the most curt manner, through the lovely purple fields, down to the railway, to watch for porcupines. Herbert was quite excited, he never having set eyes on one (whereas I who have been here a fortnight, have seen, oh—dozens!), but when we got to the first hole we found a horrid mess of quills, which meant that some Arab had had porcupine soup for supper. Our friend made up for Herbert's disappointment, as we were waiting in the dusk near another hole, by telling him the story of the Enchanted Springs. One day, he said, in this place there was a grand marriage. But it was a marriage within the forbidden bounds, the high-contracting parties being, in fact, so closely related that Mohammed (whose views on marriage, you will admit, were both broad and deep?), even Mohammed objected. I don't know if he warned the parties first, but, in any case, he let them know what he thought of them, for just as they were

all sitting down to eat a sumptuous feast, brought along by an elephant, they were all turned to stones, which steamed with hot water (tears, I suppose), including the elephant, which really does not seem quite fair.

You don't, I hope, expect me to give a less picturesque description of these baths? All I can say is that they are recommended by doctors for all kinds of diseases.

Fortunately Herbert and I can give no information on these lines. All we want the baths for is to wash in. Afterwards we have breakfast on the terrace, like every one else, *en negligé*.

This morning a sumptuous-looking Arab, with a white burnoose and a row of war-medals, sat near us drinking coffee, and eyeing us behind the French newspaper he was holding in a pair of slim, secret-looking hands.

"A neighbouring Kaid," whispers Toto. "A man of wealth, of great justice, and well-regarded by the French."

I was just thinking he had regarded us long enough, when he rose to go, followed by a pair of Egyptian-looking servants, who appeared like magic, carrying the small, mysterious trunks and cubical parcels which I suppose contained his luggage. We pictured him mounting one of those lovely white racing-camels, and looking like one of the Magi; but Toto says he travels by train, and comes here often to take the baths.

I mean to come often, too.

"Of course," says Madame, the proprietress, "we shall see you arriving. The journey is nothing if you come out straight to Bône. You know Bône? Hippo was the old name. Yes, madame, St. Augustine's Hippo."

E. COWELL.

SOME PHYSICAL PHENOMENA OF MYSTICISM

INCORRUPTION. I.

IT may be said that nearly all the phenomena which we have been considering in this series of articles are characterized by a certain element of mystery. Why should these extraordinary gifts be conceded to some holy people and withheld from others? Not a few mystics in whom such manifestations as those of levitation, stigmatization, perfumed emanations, etc., have been most conspicuous, have never been canonized. On the other hand, many of those who, both by common estimation and the judgment of the Church, are held up for veneration as among the most eminent of God's servants, have been entirely devoid of these special marks of the Divine favour. As I have more than once previously noted, it is not the aim of these articles to solve problems, but to state and classify facts. But it seems particularly necessary to reiterate this caution in approaching a question where the apparent inconsistency of God's dealings with His elect is more than usually puzzling and difficult of explanation.

No one who has even a slight acquaintance with hagiographical literature, whether in its least scientific form or in the learned folios of the *Acta Sanctorum*, can fail to be aware that the mortal remains of many saints have been preserved in some extraordinary way from that ignominious corruption of the tomb which is the common lot of our fallen humanity. Already in the fourth century we find some familiarity with this idea. Paulinus, the secretary, if we may so describe him, of the great St. Ambrose of Milan, has left us a memoir of his master in the form of a letter addressed to St. Augustine. As to the authenticity of this document there is, practically speaking, no dispute. Opinions may differ widely as to the historical trustworthiness of the writer. He records many marvellous incidents, and we may suspect him of exaggerated panegyric, but he at any rate reflects the tone of thought of devout Christians at the close of the fourth century. Now Paulinus in speaking of the discovery by St.

Ambrose (c. 396) of the body of the martyr St. Nazarius writes as follows:

At this time he (Ambrose) found the body of the holy martyr Nazarius which had been interred in a garden outside the city (Milan), and he took it up and transferred it to the Basilica of the Apostles beside the highway which leads to Rome. Now in the tomb in which the body of that martyr lay—as to the date at which he suffered, we have down to the present been able to learn nothing—we saw the martyr's blood as fresh as if it had been shed that same day. Further his head, which the wretches had cut off, was so perfect and free from corruption (*ita integrum atque incorruptum*) with all its hair and the beard, that it looked to us, at the time we moved it, as if it had been washed and laid out for inspection there in the tomb. And why should we wonder, since our Lord long ago promised in the gospel that not a hair of their head should perish. Also we were overwhelmed at the same time with so heavy a fragrance that it surpassed all perfumes in sweetness.¹

As to the fact of some translation of the body of St. Nazarius we have confirmatory evidence in the writings of St. Paulinus of Nola (a contemporary) and also in St. Gregory of Tours, but it is only from Paulinus the secretary that we learn so definitely that the head of the martyr showed no trace of corruption. Whether this is the earliest recorded example of the phenomenon in Christian history I am unable to say, but the number of instances in which the same marvellous immunity from the horrors of the tomb has been observed in subsequent ages is almost incredibly great. It will be sufficient in passing to recall, as connected with our own country, the famous cases of St. Cuthbert, St. Willibrord, St. Elphege, St. Edward the Confessor, St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, St. Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, St. Etheldreda, of Ely, and St. Werburg, of Chester. Neither can it be said that this form of manifestation has ceased in modern times. Blessed Madeleine Sophie Barat, the foundress of the Society of the Sacred Heart, died in 1865. Twenty-eight years afterwards her body was found almost perfectly entire, although the coffin was partly decayed and covered with mildew. A similar immunity from corruption was bestowed on the Blessed John Baptist Vianney, the famous Curé d'Ars, who died in 1859 and was beatified in 1905. Hardly less celebrated is the *voyante* of Lourdes, Bernadette Soubirous, with

¹ Migne, *P.L.*, Vol. XIV. p. 38.

whose visions of Our Lady in the grotto of Massabielle the whole wonderful story of the fountain and its cures began. Bernadette died in the humble obscurity of the Convent of St. Gildard at Nevers in 1879, being then 34 years of age. In 1909 her body was exhumed, and we are told by an eyewitness:

Not the least trace of corruption nor any bad odour could be perceived in the corpse of our beloved sister. Even the habit in which she was buried was intact. The face was somewhat brown, the eyes slightly sunken, and she seemed to be sleeping. The damp funeral garments were exchanged for new ones. The body was placed in a new zinc coffin lined with white silk. Within it was placed a record enclosed in a glass tube and giving an account of the opening of the coffin and the condition of the body. After this the coffin was again deposited in the mortuary chapel in our garden.¹

These last three examples are interesting because no one will pretend that the repute for sanctity which attaches to these names owes anything to the condition in which their mortal remains were discovered long after death. No doubt there may have been cases in the past where a supposed miracle of incorruption has started a whole cultus. Baron Friedrich von Hügel is inclined to attribute to this cause the outburst of popular enthusiasm which eventually brought about the canonization of St. Catherine of Genoa. He tells us, quoting from the original sources, how Catherine's body was left for about eighteen months in its first resting-place by one of the walls of the hospital church. But then "it was found that the spot was damp, owing to a conduit of water running under the wall. And the resting-place was broken up, and the coffin was opened: and the holy body was found entire from head to foot without any kind of lesion." After that we learn that there was a great concourse of people to see the remains, which were left exposed for eight days and then were transported to another site. Baron von Hügel's final conclusion is that it was the incorruption

which gave the first, and, as it turned out, an abiding impulse to the popular devotion. Indeed, as we shall see later on, it is highly improbable that, but for this condition of the body, a cultus would ever have arisen sufficiently popular and permanent

¹ Kempf, *Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century*, Eng. Trans., p. 212.

to lead on to the Beatification and Canonization. But as things now stood, the movement had been set going, and it continued on and on.¹

This may quite conceivably be a just interpretation of the course of events, so far as concerns the canonization of St. Catherine of Genoa, but it certainly cannot be maintained, and the learned critic referred to would not dream of suggesting, that in all such cases of incorruption it is the accidental immunity from physical decay which has first attracted popular attention and paved the way for a formal decree of canonization. It would be absurd to suppose that the veneration which attaches to the names of St. Theresa, St. Francis Xavier, St. Philip Neri, or St. Catherine of Siena, owed anything to the fact that their remains had not been allowed to see corruption in the ordinary course of nature. No reasonable person can doubt that these servants of God would have been canonized even if the common law of dust to dust had prevailed in their case from the first. But besides such names as those just mentioned, which are known to all the world independently of creed, there are scores of others, great missionaries, great founders of religious institutes, great preachers, great ascetics, great practisers of the spiritual and corporal works of mercy, whose fame has owed nothing at all to the accident that, many years after their work was done and their histories written, the bodies in which they had moved amongst men were found immune from decay and sometimes fragrant. Take for example such a case as that of St. Vincent de Paul, whose holiness was famous all over France long before his life had ended. He died in 1660, and it was only after numberless petitions for his canonization had been addressed to Rome that the cause was begun, and that there took place in 1712 an official inspection of the remains. More than fifty years had elapsed since the burial, but none the less when the tomb was opened, "everything," to use the words of an eye-witness, "was as when he had been laid there. The eyes and nose alone showed some decay. I counted eighteen teeth. The body was not disturbed, but those who approached saw at once that it was entire and that the soutane was not in the least damaged by time. No offensive odour was perceived, and the doctors testified that the body could not thus have

¹ *The Mystical Element of Religion*, I. p. 302.

been preserved for so long a period by any natural means."¹ It must be admitted that the integrity was not complete, and that when the tomb was again opened twenty-five years later most of the tissues had been resolved into dust, but the decay then observed seems to have been due to certain floods which had occurred during the interval. Similarly at about the same date we have remarkable accounts preserved to us of the translations of the famous Dominican Nun, the Venerable Mother Agnes of Jesus, Prioress of Langeac. She was the friend and spiritual mother of Monsieur Olier, the founder of Saint Sulpice. Her death took place October 19, 1634, and the body was buried, without evisceration or any process of embalming, like those of other members of the community, in the chapter house. After some years the bishop, in view of the procedure for her beatification, wished the remains to be interred apart. The body was then found entire and without trace of corruption. Other translations and inspections followed down to 1778. The flesh of the face and other uncovered parts disintegrated in time, but more than once, and notably in 1698 and in 1778, the scientific experts, surgeons and doctors of medicine, pronounced that the preservation of the body was, humanly speaking, inexplicable. In several of the reports, which are very fully given by her biographers Lucot and Lantages, the emanation of an extraordinary perfume from the body is much insisted on.²

Or let us take for another example the case of a great Spanish bishop, St. Thomas of Villanova, Archbishop of Valencia, who died in 1555. Twenty-three years after his burial a certain Canon of the Cathedral wished to manifest his devotion to the holy prelate by enclosing the tomb, up to this quite open, with a railing of bronze, and hanging a costly silver lamp above it. To carry out this work it was found necessary to disturb the tomb, and we are told that as a consequence of this digging the whole church was filled with perfume. Further it is stated that the body itself was uncovered and was found absolutely whole and entire, exactly

¹ I borrow these facts from Mgr. Bougaud's *History of St. Vincent de Paul*, Eng. Trans., II. p. 193. It is particularly stated that in this church of St. Lazare where the Saint's body reposed it was quite an unknown thing to find any corpse entire. See Abelly, *Vie de St. Vincent de Paul* (Ed. 1836), Vol. V. p. 221; and still more fully, Maynard, *St. Vincent de Paul*, Vol. IV. pp. 370-371. The viscera had been removed but the body was not embalmed.

² See *Vie de la V. Mère Agnès de Jésus*, Lantages et Lucot, Paris, 1863, Vol. II. pp. 533-563.

as it had been on the day of the burial, the features still wearing the same sweet expression. This was the more remarkable because, with the view apparently of frustrating the plans of certain ecclesiastics who were suspected of a design to carry the treasure off, the corpse of the Archbishop had been buried at some depth and in the actual soil.¹

Of course it must be recognized throughout in dealing with this subject that cases of a remarkable and seemingly unaccountable preservation of human remains are sufficiently common to make it rather difficult to decide in any individual instance that the absence of corruption is due to anything more than mere coincidence. We have bodies strangely desiccated like the natural mummies of Peru, of which a good many specimens may be seen in the anthropological museum of the Trocadero in Paris. We have others preserved from putrefaction in guano, of which Frank Buckland gives an account in the fourth series of his *Curiosities of Natural History*. Then there are the dried and shrivelled corpses in the gruesome Capuchin cemeteries of Palermo and Malta. "They are all dressed in the clothes they usually wore . . . the skin and muscles become as dry and hard as a piece of stockfish, and though many of them have been here upwards of two hundred and fifty years, yet none are reduced to skeletons."² Somewhat different from these are the bodies so curiously preserved in one of the Dublin churches.

As is well known the preservative qualities of the vaults under St. Michan's Church are most remarkable, and decay in the bodies committed to them is strangely arrested. The latest writer on the subject in a short notice of the church speaks of being struck (among others) "by a pathetic baby corpse, from whose plump wrists still hang the faded white ribbons of its funeral."³ This coffin bears the date 1679; yet the very finger and toe nails of the child are still distinct. The antiseptic qualities are believed to be largely attributable to the extreme dryness of the vaults and to the great freedom of their atmosphere from dust particles.⁴

Further, there are other corpses in which the normal process of decay is arrested by saponification, and there seems to

¹ See the *Acta Sanctorum*, September, Vol. V. p. 958.

² Brydone, *Tour through Sicily and Malta*, II. p. 107.

³ D. A. Chart, *Story of Dublin*.

⁴ H. F. Berry, M.R.I.A., *The Registers of the Church of St. Michan*, Dublin (1907), Preface p. vi.

be also a certain number of sporadic examples—perhaps the case of the body of the great English canonist Bishop Lyndwode, which was found centuries after his death, wrapped in cere-cloth but quite entire, may serve as an illustration—for which it is difficult to assign any adequate explanation. The Orthodox Russian Church includes amongst its saints a considerable number of bishops and other ascetics whose remains have been found entire some time after their deaths; indeed, this incorrupt condition seems to be regarded, theoretically at least, as a necessary condition for canonization in that Communion.¹ At Kiev there is a famous "laura," known as that of the Pescery, which has a sort of necropolis attached to it containing 73 bodies of "saints," all mummified and lying in open coffins, robed in rich vestments. The condition of these remains seems to be very similar to that of the corpses in the Capuchin burial crypt at Palermo. Similarly Hassert, in his account of Montenegro, speaks of the incorrupt corpse of the hermit St. Basil of Ostrog, and notes how he was expected to kiss the dried-up (*vertrocknete*) hand.² So also Schwarz saw the body of St. Peter I., the Vladika at Cetienje, who died in 1830. He speaks of "dieser dünne, steinharte Kadaver."³ But such details exist in abundance in works dealing with travel through the regions in which the Orthodox Church is dominant.

But it is not only the multitude of examples of bodies naturally preserved from decay which creates a difficulty against any premature appeal to the interference of supernatural agencies. There is also the fact that the occurrence of the phenomenon is extremely arbitrary, and, to judge by human standards, inconsistent. So far as the available evidence allows us to speak positively, there is every reason to believe that this special privilege of incorruption was not accorded to some of the greatest saints who have glorified the Church in the course of the last eight centuries. Neither in the case of St. Bernard, nor St. Francis of Assisi, nor St. Dominic, nor St. Ignatius Loyola, nor St. Vincent Ferrer, nor St. Bernardine of Siena, nor St. Alphonsus Liguori, nor St. Clare, "the Seraphic Mother," nor St. Bridget of Sweden, have we any satisfactory evidence that their mortal remains

¹ See J. Bois in *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. II. 1665—1669; and cf. P. Peeters, in *Analecta Bollandiana*, XXXIII. (1914), pp. 415 seq.

² Hassert, *Reise durch Montenegro*, Vienna, 1893, p. 27.

³ Schwarz, *Montenegro*, Leipzig, 1883, pp. 81—82.

were exempted from the common lot of humanity. On the other hand, while the privilege has been conferred upon a large number of simple and ecstatic souls, whose sojourn in this world seems to have been a continued anticipation of the angelic intuitions of Paradise, the majority of these who have been canonized for their innocence of life, and, if one may so speak, for their precocious sanctity, have not been the recipients of this special favour. St. Aloysius Gonzaga, whose festival is celebrated by the Universal Church as that of the Patron of Youth, was not found incorrupt. Neither, again, was the holy Passionist, St. Gabriel (Possenti) of Our Lady of Sorrows, who was canonized last year. The same is true of St. Stanislaus Kostka and St. John Berchmans. Now St. Gabriel was just 24 when he died, St. Aloysius 23, St. John Berchmans 22, and St. Stanislaus not quite 18. One would have thought that if anything could be regarded as likely to exempt any son of man from the curse laid upon us through our father Adam, it would be the virginal innocence of lives such as these, and yet it is certain that in a very few years all these bodies were reduced to dust. In the case of holy virgins of the other sex we have perhaps rather more examples of incorruption at a relatively early age. St. Rose of Viterbo, whose body remained intact for many centuries, is commonly said to have died at the age of eighteen, but this is quite uncertain. We know that she died in the middle of the thirteenth century, but we have no record of the exact year, and still less of the year of her birth. St. Rose of Lima, whose body was exhumed and found quite entire six months after death, was 31 when she passed to a better world. St. Clare of Montefalco, one of the most famous Italian examples of immunity from putrefaction, lived to the age of 33. St. Mary Magdalen of Pazzi, mentioned by Pope Benedict XIV. as a celebrated instance of the same phenomenon, was 41 at the time of her death. Blessed Mariana of Jesus, known as the "Lily of Quito," was relatively quite young. She went to heaven at the age of 24. A month later, when her body was transferred to a new tomb, it was found beautiful and supple like that of one who had just died. However, three years afterwards (in 1646), the coffin was again opened, and all the flesh had then crumbled to dust, though there came from the remains a fragrant perfume which filled the whole church. Of more recent date is the rather extraordinary case of Maria

Christina, the daughter of Victor Emmanuel I., King of Piedmont, and bride of Ferdinand II., King of the Two Sicilies. She had been married nearly four years when she died in 1836, at the age of 24, shortly after the birth of her only child. Seventeen years later, when the cause of her beatification had been introduced as the result of many alleged miracles, the body is said to have been found intact.¹ It is, of course, possible that some embalming process had been resorted to after death, but this is not stated, and it is difficult to suppose that the immunity of the remains from corruption could have been accounted in any way wonderful if this had taken place. Another curious instance, belonging still more nearly to our own times, is that of Father Paul Mary Pakenham, C.P. In 1850, Captain the Hon. Charles Pakenham, of the Grenadier Guards, who, through his aunt, Lady Katherine Pakenham, the wife of the first Duke of Wellington, was the nephew by marriage of the hero of Waterloo, was received into the Catholic Church. He entered the Passionist Order and became a priest, but after less than two years of very fervent ministry, he died in the beginning of March, 1857, at the age of 36. Now in the Memoir of Father Paul Mary, published in 1915,² we find the following interesting account of the exhumation of his remains:

In March 1894, thirty seven years after the happy death of Father Paul Mary, the chapel built by him, which had long stood useless, was finally removed to give way to a new cemetery for the use of the religious community at Mount Argus. During the removal of the remains of the dead religious from the old burial place to the new, the members of the then community, doubtless moved by holy curiosity, had the coffin containing the body of Father Paul Mary Pakenham opened. Whether it was due to natural or supernatural causes we do not care to conjecture, but the body was then found perfectly intact and incorrupt, and the face wore a most lifelike expression as of one who lay in a peaceful slumber. The writer had the happiness of being present on that occasion and will never forget the sight, nor the emotion of some members of the original community who stood by the coffin then as they stood by it in their fresh sorrow for their saintly father's loss almost forty years before. The coffin was afterwards closed and reverently lowered into its new resting place where now, close beneath the great Celtic cross

¹ See e.g., Kempf, *Holiness of the Church in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 282.

² *Pauli Mary Pakenham, Passionist*. By the Rev. Joseph Smith, C.P. Sands and Co., Edinburgh, 1915, p. 117.

which overshadows the cemetery, all that is mortal of Father Paul Mary Pakenham awaits the resurrection of the just.

It must not of course be supposed that we are always left so completely without guidance regarding the natural or supernatural origin of these interferences with the ordinary processes of decay, as in the two cases just cited. No examples would be more suggestive of design on the part of Divine Providence than those in which the exemption from corruption is only partial, as for instance in the preservation of the tongue of St. Anthony of Padua, when all the rest of the body had crumbled to dust. Unfortunately in many cases of this class the historical evidence is apt to be defective on one side or the other. That St. Anthony's tongue was in reality found red, soft and entire can hardly be doubted. The Bollandists give an engraving of it in its reliquary as it existed in their day, more than 400 years after his lifetime. But after all, the recorded facts of the history of St. Anthony furnish no clear and outstanding reason why the tongue of the Saint should have been preserved, in preference, let us say, to his heart or his right hand. In the similar case of St. John Nepomucen, who died a martyr to the secrecy of the confessional, the preservation of the tongue is entirely appropriate and significant, but the evidence that this organ was specially singled out to be alone immune from corruption might perhaps be stronger than it is. Still, Benedict XIV. tells us in his *De Canonizatione Sanctorum*¹ that a formal examination was made of this delicate member in 1725, 382 years after Nepomucen's martyrdom. The scientific experts found that it was entire, retaining the normal shape, size and colour of the tongue of a living man, and further that it was still both soft and flexible. Certainly it would seem very hard to suggest any natural explanation of the phenomenon, and Benedict, who, as he informs us, was Promotor Fidei (vulgarly "Devil's Advocate") at the time this investigation took place, after doing his best to argue against it, fully concurred in the decision of the Congregation of Sacred Rites that this wonderful conservation of the tongue might be accepted as an authentic miracle of the second class. Unfortunately the evidence is not always so satisfactory, nor the application so obvious. The heart of St. Bridget of Sweden may have been found

¹ Lib. IV. Pars 1, cap. 30, § 15.

fresh and entire when all the rest save her bones was reduced to dust, but, apart from testimonies to prove the permanence of the heart in the same state, we cannot altogether rule out the possibility of coincidence. Similarly for the alleged preservation of the hand of St. Stephen of Hungary, or again, of the hand of our own King Oswald, or of the thumb of St. Edith of Wilton, the evidence must be held to be lacking in that historical precision which can alone bring entire conviction. With regard, however, to the general question of immunity from corruption, and in particular with regard to certain specially chosen examples, there are still several considerations which would prevent us from regarding the phenomenon as in all cases explicable by natural causes. But limitations of space must preclude any further discussion of this theme in my present article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

Since the above was in type I have stumbled upon the following account of the body of St. Clare of Montefalco in the *Cornhill Magazine* for October, 1881. The writer is—of all people in the world—Mr. John Addington Symonds:

A handsome young man appeared who conducted us with decent gravity into a little darkened chamber behind the altar. There he lighted wax tapers, opened sliding doors in what looked like a long coffin, and drew curtains. Before us in the dim light there lay a woman covered with a black nun's dress. Only her hands and the exquisitely beautiful pale outline of her face (forehead, nose, mouth, and chin, modelled in purest outline, as though the injury of death had never touched her), were visible. Her closed eyes seemed to sleep. She had the perfect peace of Luini's St. Catherine borne by angels to her grave on Sinai. I have rarely seen anything which surprised and touched me more. . . . S. Chiara's shrine was hung round with her relics; and among these the heart extracted from her body was suspended. Upon it, apparently wrought into the very substance of the mummified flesh, were impressed a figure of the crucified Christ, the scourge, and the five stigmata. The guardian's faith in this miraculous witness to her sainthood, the gentle piety of the men and women who knelt before it, checked all expressions of incredulity.

H. T.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE FUTILITY OF REUNION EXCEPT WITH ROME.

WE need not regret that, so far, there has been no real response to the proposals for reunion sketched at the Lambeth Conference for, although the sects remain as before in their separate compartments, still there is a clearer recognition of the fact that, as reunion by sacrifice of principle would be dishonest, there can be no real unity except by the acceptance of the same principles. And to arrive at identical convictions in regard to matters which are beyond the final reach of human reason, only one way is even conceivable, viz., obedience to a living authority who can justly claim submission. All other schemes and projects are either mere verbiage incapable of any clear interpretation or, when analysed, will be seen to deny this postulate of reason. Now the grounds on which the non-Catholic sects repudiate the Church of Rome are founded on principle. Her claim to possess exclusively and to teach infallibly the whole of Christ's revelation, they hold to be unwarranted and indeed demonstrably unsound. To grant her claim, which is absolute and admits of no compromise, would be to sin against their convictions: hence, so long as they are in that frame of mind, there can be no genuine union with her. She must abandon her unique position, lose in fact her identity, before there can be question of it. Is there the same objection in principle to union between the sects? The discussions provoked by the Lambeth proposals seem to show that there is. We cannot suppose that mere attachment to particular forms of worship, mere pride in historical peculiarities of development, would keep earnest men from that union which is so plainly the desire and purpose of their common Master, Christ. It is not outward differences that keep them apart, but inward divergence of belief in such matters as the requisites for salvation, the nature of the Church, of the ministerial office, of grace and the sacraments, of the dread Personality of our Lord Himself. To adopt any semblance of external unity whilst honestly differing in such essential points of doctrine is a thing which they shrink from instinctively.

There could be no permanence in such superficial unity, a mere cloak to shroud the scandal of division. Hence, although the various sects may be, and indeed declare themselves to be, ready to acknowledge each other's useful contributions to the sum total of Christian expression—a readiness which marks them off at once from the one Church which denies the claim of any other to be the Church of Christ—they will not give up what constitutes them what they are, their particular characteristic tenets.

Now, it is a great thing to have this recognized. It is a great thing that all should, as all practically do, deplore division as contrary to the Christian ideal. And a still greater thing that all should see that the Christian ideal cannot be realized by any human arrangement or compromise, but only by all discovering a living authority commissioned to speak in the name of Christ, and therefore guaranteed from error. In other words, the Lambeth suggestions are forcing minds to this conviction—Christian Unity is impossible unless all Christians belong to the same visible Church, but no Church can rightly invite the allegiance of all Christians unless it makes the same claims as the Church of Rome. That issue cannot be evaded by the Christian except by denying that Christ founded a Church at all, which is equivalently denying the reality of the Incarnation.

J. K.

DISSECTION VERSUS RESURRECTION.

IN her recently published and much discussed work, *The Earthen Vessel*, Lady Glenconner, not content with providing what she considers to be convincing evidence for the possibility of communication between the living and the dead, has ventured on a little excursion into the realm of dogmatic theology. Throughout the chapter she is very severe in her condemnation of "The Church" for looking upon the activities of Spiritualism as antagonistic to the teaching of the Gospels. She says much about the "monkish ignorance" of the Middle Ages, she assures us that the Church is shackled by mediæval doctrine, she warns us against the "clumsy misunderstanding" of texts of which she is good enough to disclose the real significance, and she particularly commends the study of Theosophy in order that we may "become enlightened as to the psychic constitution of Man." There is

much in all this that invites comment, but we must content ourselves for the moment with a single definite issue. Speaking of "the resurrection of the body," an article of the faith which she apparently interprets in a curiously literal and inelastic sense, Lady Glenconner says:

I do not mean that the Church still believes in the resurrection of the body, no one now thinks dissection to be inimical to the Resurrection Morning; (and yet—can it be believed?—this was the reason why for years dissection was illegal, and the progress of medical science seriously retarded, while in its interest the odious practice of body-snatching prevailed); but I do mean that it would infinitely increase the Church's influence, were she to recast some of the forms of worship, correcting mis-statements, and reanimating her great machinery by a fresh influx of this truth. It is not good for people's souls, to keep saying what they know is not true, and it is quite as dishonest as some of the charges brought against Spiritualism.¹

There are many points both in the matter and form of this paragraph which suggest criticism, but the question of fact naturally takes precedence. It would be hard to exhibit in one sentence more confusion of thought than is involved in this pronouncement upon the history of dissection. To begin with, where has Lady Glenconner learnt that dissection was illegal? What Act of Parliament,² or what judicial interpretation of the Common Law ever declared it illegal? There were numerous cases in which living men, in exchange for a sum of money down, bequeathed their bodies to the surgeons for the express purpose of being dissected, and the law recognized and upheld such bequests. Further, who was there that ever did think "dissection to be inimical to the Resurrection Morning"? It would be conceivable that some very muddle-headed and ignorant person might believe that the dissection of a human body would interfere with its rising again at the Day of Judgment, but even so, one does not usually speak of Doomsday as "the Resurrection Morning." What Lady Glenconner no doubt means to suggest is that in the idea of the Church a corpse divided into many pieces cannot so easily be put together again—a Humpty Dumpty sort of conception which would indicate that her theological researches had not been very profound. And again, what

¹ *The Earthen Vessel*, p. 126.

² 32 Henry VIII. ch. 42 §2, expressly provides that the bodies of certain executed felons should be surrendered for the use of the Surgeons.

does Lady Glenconner understand by "the Church"? If she is thinking of the Church of England she may be correct in supposing that many members of that Communion no longer believe in the resurrection of the body, but this is certainly not true of the Catholic Church, nor of many Ritualists. On the other hand, if it is the historical Church of western Christendom which has incurred her displeasure, the idea that the resurrection of the body was held to be endangered by dissection is simply ludicrous. If there is any class of the human family whom the Church regards as certain to rise again with glorified bodies at the last day it is the saints and martyrs. And yet ever since the early Middle Ages she has, often to the scandal of her critics, allowed the bodies of these to be dismembered and scattered broadcast, an arm here, a thigh-bone there, a skull somewhere else, not to speak of the innumerable tiny fragments sealed up in every altar-stone in Christendom upon which Mass is offered.

In point of fact, the only countries in the world in which body-snatching has been prevalent are those lands in which English Protestantism has exercised a dominant influence, to wit, Great Britain and America. It is only here that the study of anatomy has been hampered and that no provision was formerly made for such a reasonable supply of dead bodies as the surgeons required. Since the bodies of murderers alone were conceded by the law for this purpose,¹ a prejudice was very naturally created in the minds of the people against the employment of a corpse for any such use. It was felt even among the poor that a stigma inevitably rested upon all the connections of one whose body had been treated like that of a murderer. Consequently the supply of anatomical subjects fell far short of the demand, and the body-snatchers or "Resurrectionists," as they were called, did a roaring trade. No difficulty of this sort existed either in the seventeenth or eighteenth century in such Catholic lands as Italy and France. If Lady Glenconner doubts it, let her refer to any easily accessible authority, such, for example, as the article "Anatomy" in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. We read there (Vol. I. p. 937): "In France,

¹ Hundreds of criminals were executed for robbery, arson and many other felonies, but only those convicted of wilful murder were handed over to the surgeons; and even of these many were not available because they were further sentenced to be hanged in chains.

Italy, Portugal, and Austria no popular objection was raised to the bodies of friendless people who died in hospitals, or those whose burial was paid for by the State, being dissected, provided a proper religious service was held over them." Mr. J. B. Bailey, who has produced a valuable little monograph on this subject, may be cited as another witness. Speaking of Italy generally, this writer says:

The rule was that all persons who died in hospital were given up for dissection if required; but by paying the cost of the funeral, friends could if they wished take away the body. This, however, was seldom done. There was generally a sufficient supply of bodies; but if this ran short, the subjects were detained from "the deposit" of poor people who died and were buried at the public cost. In every parish church in Italy there was a chamber in which all the dead bodies of the poor were deposited during the day-time, after the religious ceremonies had been performed over them in the church; at night these bodies were removed either to the dissecting-rooms or to the burial fields outside the town. Body snatching was quite unknown.¹

From the same well-informed writer we learn that in the discussions which preceded the passing of the Anatomy Act of 1832, one of the best known surgeons of the day, Mr. (afterwards Sir) William Lawrence, thus pointed out the great advantages of the student on the Continent as compared with his brethren in England:

I see many medical persons from France, Germany and Italy, and have found from my intercourse with them, that anatomy is much more successfully cultivated in those countries than in England; at the same time I know, from their numerous valuable publications on anatomy, that they are far before us in this science; we have no original standard works at all worthy of the present state of knowledge.²

Lady Glenconner's revised Creed would seem to run: "I believe in the Communication of Spirits, the dissection of the body and life ever-reincarnate. Amen." This may be acceptable to Theosophists and the followers of New Thought, but it is hardly recommended to Christians by reasoning in the style of which the paragraph quoted above supplies a specimen.

H. T.

¹ J. B. Bailey, Librarian of the Royal College of Surgeons, *The Diary of a Resurrectionist*, p. 121.

² *Ibid.* p. 118.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

**Enforced
Reparation.**

The expected has happened. Faced by the Allied demands for the fulfilment of the Treaty terms of reparation, as determined by the Paris Conference of January 29th, the Germans on March 1st made a counter-proposal so weak and inadequate that it amounted to a blank refusal. They were given the rest of the week to deliberate, but on Monday, March 7th, had nothing fresh to propose, and could only ask for further delay. This was peremptorily refused them, and the application of the threatened sanctions was at once begun. Several Rhineland towns have been occupied and arrangements have been made to collect customs between German territories east and west of the Rhine: moreover, the Allies have agreed to take, with Parliamentary sanction, half the price of all German goods sold in their respective countries. Assuming that the various Parliaments pass this legislation, people are not agreed as to its likelihood of success. Here we can but state the main principles. Germany can pay only out of her surplus wealth: to produce surplus wealth to the extent required, her trade must flourish exceedingly: her trade cannot flourish if handicapped by such a tariff in so many directions: it is not likely that the German Government will agree to reimburse its traders, and if not they will seek markets amongst the neutral nations and undersell the Allies in those quarters. The economic interdependence of the nations seems to us to be ignored by this policy of high compulsory indemnities. The free coal sent into France under the Treaty has brought about a crisis in our coal trade and injured the French mining industry. The vast amount of German shipping which has accrued to the British and other Allies, has stopped ship-building here, whilst depriving Germany of one means of regaining her prosperity. The great increase in German imports necessary to make the 50% tax really productive will still further injure our home manufactures. The Premier himself said on February 5th: "If Germany paid in goods, it would throw hundreds of thousands of workmen out of work in France, in Italy, in America, and in every country receiving the indemnity." Such is the character of the Capitalist wage-system that all excess of supply immediately produces unemployment. This would not matter if the wage-earner was also a small capitalist or land-owner and could subsist on his own resources until the excess was absorbed, but as things are he must work or starve or live the life of a parasite.

**Will it Pay
to make
Germany Pay?**

Many writers are endeavouring to show that Germany is really prosperous, and is less heavily taxed than the Allies, that in fact the defeated aggressor is in a better position financially than the conquering Allies. It is plain that whilst the Allies are crushed under the weight of armaments some five times as expensive as before the war, Germany is free from that terrible burden. But she has lost her mercantile marine and the potential riches of her colonies, and although there may be much wealth in the country, as evidenced by the extravagance of the rich, still it is so badly distributed and so inadequately taxed that those least responsible for the war are the greatest sufferers from its results. If some plan could be devised whereby the excessive wealth concentrated in a few hands and not usefully employed could be bodily transferred to the Allied exchequers in relief of home taxation, then neither justice nor charity would raise objection, but though Germany is nominally a Socialist State and has actually limited fortunes by legislation, that legislation has not been effective. Those responsible for the war, the financiers and the politicians, will not suffer. It is the German poor that will be cruelly sweated by the process of exacting of punitive reparations, just as the poor over here will suffer if they are successfully exacted. We need say nothing of the prolongation of European unrest, the perpetuation of hostile feelings, the indefinite postponement of any real League of Nations, the sowing of the seeds of future war, which the forcible collection of indemnities will entail. That the financial result will be, or can be, any real equivalent for the evil moral effects is a matter of grave doubt. Even the Prime Minister the other day had a glimpse of the truth when he said in the House of Commons—"Loving your enemies is not only sound Christianity, it is good business." "Loving," in this sense is "doing as you would be done by," *i.e.*, making your own rational self-regard and self-love the rule of your treatment of others. Had the Allies been beaten in an unrighteous war, they would have been glad of consideration at the hands of the victors, and of peace terms which would enable them to co-operate in re-establishing the prosperity of the world. The terms they have imposed upon Germany do not seem likely to produce that result. We are not questioning their justice: we only think that they will not make for peace.

**A New Spirit
Wanted.**

Applying Christian principles to this question, however, does not mean condoning fraud or forgetting the existence of public right or implying that repentance should not precede forgiveness. Fraud should be detected and exposed, public right should be vindicated, repentance insisted on. But in dealing

with a great nation still rocking from the effects of revolution, composed of a variety of States and agitated by divergent policies, it is difficult to detect a common consciousness, much less to imbue it with a certain moral character. We have always protested against the German people being reckoned as conscious criminals in the matter of the European War. Apart from crimes committed in the course of it, which were not only on one side, those really guilty of the unjust aggression which has cost the world so dear are relatively few. It is doubtful if even the ex-Kaiser, a puppet of his militarists, can be reckoned amongst them. There is no evidence that the people as a whole, debauched though many were by an evil, un-Christian political philosophy, were committed to a war of conquest. Yet the Peace Treaty aimed, first of all, at punishment and not at reconciliation. According to General Smuts,¹ it was "a Punic Peace, the same sort of peace as the victor had dictated to the vanquished for thousands of years." Its terms were imposed, not negotiated, and imposed in their own interests by judges who were themselves the plaintiffs. Their effect will be to make generations who had no share in the war suffer for their fathers' misdeeds, and thus to keep alive the tradition of hostility. Instead of making it possible for ruined Europe to combine in a united effort for the restoration of prosperity, the blockade was continued until amongst our late foes human vitality and the productiveness of nature were grievously impaired. Austria is hopelessly beggared and bankrupt, and her sickness is infecting Central Europe. There has been no recognition of human solidarity in the economic field. Writing in February, 1920, about the Versailles Treaty, which had then just been formally ratified after a year of incubation, we rejoiced at the ratification, because it put an end to the war period and set free machinery by which the Treaty could be amended. It has been amended, inasmuch as the indemnities now asked are less than the Treaty demanded and the time of payment is extended, but there is no change in the vengeful spirit that originally dictated it. There is still no recognition of the fact that it would be good policy to ask from our beaten foes less even than we could obtain. Whatever Mr. George thinks now, neither he nor his colleagues have acted as if forgiveness of injuries were good business as well as sound Christianity.

**Relief for the
Turk.**

There has been no scruple about tampering with the Treaty of Sèvres, which is just as august a document, and has the same *provenance* as the Treaty of Versailles. It is now proposed to restore Constantinople to the Turks, to take

¹ *Central News* quoting from the *New York Evening Post*.

from Greece much of the territory assigned to her, to rearrange the map of Asia Minor, to evacuate Cilicia, and to make various modifications in regard to finance and military matters. The Greeks and the Turks are to discuss these new terms between themselves, so it may be months before that part of the world is settled. But the need of so radical a revision illustrates the fallibility of the original treaty-makers. The Christian conscience, so often outraged by his crimes, must perforce be satisfied with the practical disappearance of the Turk from Europe and the cessation of his rule over any Christian people.

**The
New President
and the Old.**

America has not signed the Treaty of Versailles. Strange to say, America's relations with Germany are still technically governed by the terms of the Armistice of November, 1918. To ex-President Wilson, the idealist, has now succeeded President Harding, whose inaugural speech seems to point to a determination to dissociate himself very thoroughly from his predecessor's views and aims. Mr. Wilson looked abroad and concerned himself with humanity. Mr. Harding will therefore confine himself to home affairs and the material interests of his own people. Mr. Wilson broke through the traditional isolation of the States, even to the extent of visiting Europe during his term of office, and receiving a measure of consideration and homage far in excess of that offered to constitutional monarchs. Mr. Harding will therefore reaffirm without compromise the old narrow view that the New World alone concerns America. Mr. Wilson became the champion of oppressed European nationalities, but Mr. Harding "seeks no part in directing the destinies of the Old World," and seems inclined to let Europe stew in her own juice. Yet it may be that this cautious and, at first sight, somewhat selfish and material outlook of the new "Chief Executive" promises better for the world than the exalted idealism of Mr. Wilson. The latter seemed to imperil American political independence and to threaten American peace: these supreme concerns safeguarded, Mr. Harding will, we trust, prove no less eager than Mr. Wilson to uproot the causes of war and, in his own words, "to do our part in making offensive warfare so hateful that Governments and peoples who resort to it must prove the righteousness of their cause, or stand as outlaws before the bar of civilization." "America," he says again, "is ready, to encourage, eager to initiate, anxious to participate in, any seemly programme likely to lessen the probability of war and promote that brotherhood of mankind which must be God's highest conception of human relationship." These words are tuned to a lower key than Mr. Wilson's magnificent utterances, which all Europe took to be the authentic voice of America, but they are

not out of harmony with them. We trust that, backed by his colossal majority, and supported in this even by his opponents, the Republican President will succeed where the Democrat failed in slaying the dragon of militarism.

**The Papal Basis
for
International Peace.**

"Abolish conscription and you break the teeth of war," wrote Sir Ian Hamilton some time ago, echoing a declaration of the Papal Secretary of State. "Substitute Right for Might," cried the Pope himself in his famous Peace Note of August, 1917, "and therefore reduce your armies to domestic police forces, establish international courts of arbitration, restore the true freedom and common enjoyment of the seas."¹ There can be no peace, but at best only an armistice, whilst great nations compete in mighty armaments: there can be no justice when the parties at suit are prepared to resist an unfavourable decision by force. What are these "interests" that nations are so keen about safeguarding? Are they not mere concerns of trade, opportunities of money making, commercial rivalries? Needful, no doubt, in their measure for national prosperity, although often resulting in accentuating the mal-distribution of wealth, but not, by any Christian standard, of higher account than justice and morality. When shall we see any powerful State deliberately forgo, as Belgium did at the outset of the war, material advantage for conscience' sake?

**Why not
Negotiate with
Ireland?**

The Anglican Bishop of Manchester makes, in *The Pilgrim*, the excellent monthly review which he edits,² the same plea as we have often urged in this place, in the interests of Christian peace and justice, for a reasoned discussion of the issue between the sister nations of England and Ireland, at present submitted to the blind forces of war.

The first necessity [he writes] is that we should understand Ireland. We must want to hear the Irish case stated as an Irishman would wish to state it. . . . There is need to insist on the duty of hearing the Irish case sympathetically stated. . . . The source of [Irish] distrust is not hard to find. As usual, it is self concern. We have never considered the Irish question without reservations: one of the reservations—perhaps the only one—has been that never shall Ireland be independent, in the sense of being able to form an alliance with a hostile country. We cannot risk

¹ See the passage, of which these words are a condensed paraphrase, in *The Pope's Peace Note: text and comments* (C.S.G., 1d.), pp. 5—6.

² Issue for April, p. 245.

an enemy at our gates closing the sea-ways and completing our encirclement. That is exactly what Prussia said about Poland. . . . Yet we held that Poland had a right to be independent if she wished, and that Germany held her against her will was part of the proof that the German State-system was inherently wicked. Germany was led to outrage the national sentiment of Poland partly at least by the desire of security. The same desire on our part prevents our adopting towards Ireland the impartiality which is necessary to the formation of a just policy.

Then the Bishop proceeds to urge that, even if security should be endangered, an impartial judgment should be formed and followed. But there is no fear of security being endangered, even though Ireland should be independent. The protection of each country is necessary to the other. We cannot conceive the smaller nation, which is bound so closely with the other by economic ties, refusing any guarantees which were thought necessary. Negotiations might be initiated to-morrow, if only, as the Bishop suggests "reservations" were laid aside, and a grievous scandal to Christendom and injury to the world's peace brought to an end. What malign influence is it that is so constantly destroying the prospects of a truce?

**Anglicans
and
Divorce.**

In the debate on Lord Gorell's Matrimonial Causes Bill which is still under discussion in the Lords, the Anglican Bishop of Durham voiced the perplexity of those who profess regard for the moral law but who deny the existence of a Church commissioned to interpret it. After stating that "ecclesiastical authority is in a hopeless state of division" on the question of the legality of divorce—which is equivalent to saying that he does not believe in a Church qualified to teach—the Bishop goes on:

We have nothing to guide us in determining what were the principles enunciated by the Divine Founder of Christianity, except accumulated facts and experience.

How "accumulated facts and experience" could ever be a certain guide to our Lord's teaching the Bishop does not say, nor does he seem to realize the implications of his attitude. If the Church does not know what is right and what is wrong in this subject of divorce, a question which is moral in its very essence, how is she a guide to morality in any other? What then is the use of bishops, who are *ex officio* teachers and guides? If the laws of morality, like the "laws" of science, are to be painfully deduced from "accumulated facts and experience," what

becomes of Divine revelation? And what can the Bishop think of the Divine Founder of Christianity, who is thus supposed to have left mankind in ignorance of a fact which lies at the very basis of Christian society? No wonder that the peers who are members of the Church of England pay no heed to their pastors, shepherds who leave the flock to choose the way. The Archbishop of York, though asserting that in his conviction "marriage is dissoluble only by death," yet spoke and voted for a Bill which opens a still wider door to the sin of adultery; his justification is yet more curious than his action, for it amounted to this: equality demands that it should be as easy for the woman as for the man, for the poor as for the well-to-do, to free themselves from this indissoluble bond, and to commit, should they so desire, bigamy. Lord Braye, as a Catholic, objected to the whole principle of the Bill, without however developing the Church's well-known theological position. It should be borne in mind that our objection to divorce rests just as positively upon its evil civil effects. We denounce it not only as a direct violation of the Divine law but also as the solvent of family life and of civil society.

**The
Crusade against
Immorality.**

Another Anglican prelate, the Bishop of London, is at present playing a more worthy rôle in the same House of Lords than those we have mentioned. He is the author of a Criminal Law Amendment Bill, introduced on March 9th, which has for object the protection of young women from the lusts of evil men. We have no wish to debate such a question here: all we desire to call attention to is the difficulty, manifested in the discussion and in the Press, of securing fair legislation on sex-questions from a legislature composed entirely of men, and the uniformly low standard aimed at by the bulk of such male disputants. Sir Herbert Stephen, who writes¹ in opposition to the Bishop's proposals on the ground that the "actually existing morality of the British public," which he deduces from the practice of juries in trying sexual cases, will not tolerate the making of crimes of what are now merely sins; in other words, the backing up of the moral law by civil penalties. And a County Court Judge, again speaking from his experience of juries, protests: against turning "particular sins" into felonies. These men are arguing from male public opinion and the practice of juries exclusively male: perhaps now that women can make their opinions not only known but felt, and can take part on juries in the administration of the law, the "morality of the British public," which includes women as well as men, may be somewhat

¹ *The Times*, March 9.

² *The Times*, March 12.

raised and this improvement reflected in the conduct of juries. Meanwhile the Bishop's Bill deserves every support, as making for the purification of public life. The County Court Judge would have us rely in these matters on "Christian teaching" and the "efficacy of the Gospel message," not on the arm of the law. But we call in the arm of the law to assist Christian teaching in regard to the rights of property and a thousand other points of morality. It is only when sexual licence is threatened that the charge of Puritanism is brought against those who would have it punished, and punished heavily, since it so often results in the ruin, bodily and spiritual, of the young and helpless.

**The Need
of a
Fixed Easter.**

The unusually early incidence of Easter this year gives additional point to the long-drawn agitation, embodied in a Parliamentary measure,¹ for the fixing of this great but very moveable Feast. Our readers will recall the lucid little article² which we published last June from the pen of a Professor in Switzerland, wherein it was pointed out that an easy and symmetrical division of the year could be made, if only one day (in leap years, two) were excluded from the numerical reckoning. The date of Easter could then be readily fixed and would always come on the same day of the month, for instance, Sunday, April 7th, or Sunday, April 14th. However, the projected legislation aims only at fixing the date of Easter, which, of course, must be on a Sunday, and therefore cannot, with the present Calendar, be always assigned to the same day of the month but will vary within a week. It is needless to enumerate the immense practical conveniences which would be secured by this minimum of change. A glance at the very various dates fixed by schools for the Easter holidays this year will indicate not the least. What is to be desired is that the Church herself, as in previous Calendar reforms, should initiate or, at least, co-operate with legislation in this matter, so as to minimize the disturbance which the change would occasion. If only the Holy See were duly represented in the League of Nations, a ready means could be thus found for securing the consent of the whole world to a simultaneous alteration of the present rule. That the Church need not hesitate about making this change has been recently shown in an interesting historical article by Abbot Cabrol,³ who suggests the first Sunday after March 25th as, on the whole, the most convenient date.

¹ Lord Desborough proposes that Easter should be fixed for the second Sunday in April from 1922 onward.

² "Calendar Reform," *THE MONTH*, June, 1920, p. 556.

³ *The Tablet*, March 12.

**The
Revolt against
Dogma.**

An interesting glimpse of non-Catholic mentality, the mental state of those who make human reason the ultimate measure of truth, and therefore, implicitly it may be, reject revelation, is given in the Preface of a very interesting book with a misleading catchpenny title—"The Secrets of the Vatican," by Mr. Douglas Sladen. The author aimed so successfully at kindliness of feeling and objectivity of view in his representation of the life led by the Pope, and the art treasures of the Papal Palace, that he felt constrained in his Preface to explain to his fellow Protestants that he was not himself a Papist—an unconscious indication of what non-Catholics expect when Rome is concerned.

I am myself a Protestant [he writes], a member of the Church of England. My idea of patriotism makes it impossible that I should ever leave the Church of my forefathers. But it is only upon the Rights and the Independence of the Church [of England] that I have strong feelings; the differences of dogma which have grown up since it parted from the Church of Rome do not concern me. I feel towards the Church of Rome as an Anglophile American feels towards England: I feel that I sprang from it. [Yet what about leaving the Church of his forefathers?] I do not forget that I belonged to it, until the Middle Ages . . . were ended."¹

In another edition ² he again explains:

. . . I take this opportunity of reiterating that it would be impossible for me ever to become a member of the Roman Church; I am constitutionally incapable of believing in any dogma.

Thus it is clear that at least one member of the English Church thinks it possible to be an Anglican without accepting a fixed revelation. And it must be said that the notion receives a good deal of encouragement from many Anglican teachers. Canon Barnes, for instance, reckons the hypotheses of "Science" as more certain than the most vital Christian doctrines, and he is only typical of the rationalist school of Anglicans. That is the mentality the Catholic apologist has often to meet: he must establish the reasonableness of revelation before he can begin to prove the fact.

¹ Preface to *The Secrets of the Vatican*. By Douglas Sladen, p. ix.

² Preface to Cheap Edition, 1910.

**A Relic
of
Barbarism.**

The gambling-hell at Monte Carlo is responsible for much moral perversion, as are all haunts of pleasure frequented by the idle rich. But details about the barbarous practice of pigeon-shooting in vogue there have offended the public conscience almost as much as the usual records of luxury, waste, and suicide. That people should be found to defend this "sport" shows how far traditional usage can blunt human feelings. The outcry against the practice in *The Times* has revealed that it is not confined to the haunts of the idle and dissipated, but is common in different parts of England as well. It would seem that legislation is needed to suppress it, and certainly its prevalence here makes it impossible for English public opinion with any consistency to insist on the proprietors of the Casino abolishing it. Enjoyment which necessitates, as this kind of shooting does, the torture of animals, is a relic of, or rather a reversion to, barbarism.

**The
Appeal of the
C.T.S.**

We are glad to gather that the appeal for support of the C.T.S., which for the past few weeks has been going out to Catholics all over the country, is meeting with marked success. A large increase in the number of members is reported as one result, and this perhaps is the most satisfactory feature. For although generous Catholics can be trusted to contribute from time to time fairly large donations, the assured working income of a Society of this sort should accrue from the annual subscriptions of members. The couple of thousand which has hitherto formed the total is a reproach to English Catholicity. A Trade Union, aiming only at material benefits, can enrol its members by the hundred thousand. Here is an object the value of which is incalculably great, the realization of God's purpose in the Incarnation, and here is a means which, apart from the actual official organization of the Church, is the most direct and efficacious. Can we not hope that the membership of the C.T.S. will be multiplied by ten or even by one hundred, and thus secure for it the financial support that the importance of its work deserves? The Appeal speaks of the issue of a "Catholic Encyclopedia in pamphlet form." That ideal might easily be realized by a steady and united effort on the part of our priests and people. Our churches and chapels should provide a ready means of distributing pamphlets by the thousand, and these will form an indispensable part of the equipment of the vigorous and growing Catholic Evidence Guild. There are no limits to the efficacy of the "Word of the Lord," thus administered for the healing of modern society.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

"Christ without Dogma": Absurdity of [L. B. Tibbits in *America*, March 5, 1921, p. 469].

Civil Authority, The Origin of [A. O'Rahilly in *Studies*, March, 1921, p. 39].

Divorce a Vinculo, The Scripture argument against [H. Pope, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Feb., 1921, p. 670].

Mortal and Venial Sin in the Early Church [B. V. Miller in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1921, p. 236].

Old Testament Prophecy: Nature of [J. Flynn, S.J., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1921, p. 271].

Prayer, Right and Wrong Notions of [G. Byrne, S.J., in *Month*, April, 1921, p. 309].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Augustine, The Catholicism of St. [A. d'Alès in *Etudes*, March 5—20, 1921, p. 513].

Fossil Man [P. T. de Chardin in *Etudes*, March 5—20, 1921, p. 570].

Press Bureau in U.S.A., Catholic [M. Williams in *America*, Feb. 26, 1921, p. 446].

Y.M.C.A., Papal Action and [J. H. Fisher, S.J., in *America*, Feb. 26, 1921, p. 450].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Catholicism and Nationalism in Germany [Pierre Waline in *Revue des Jeunes*, March 10, 1921, p. 534].

Catholic Women and the Jury [M. E. Haviland in *Catholic Citizen*, March 15, 1921, p. 23].

Easter, Arguments in favour of a fixed [Abbot Cabrol in *Tablet*, March 12, 1921, p. 329].

Einstein's Relativity Theory criticized and rejected [J. T. Blankart in *Catholic World*, Feb., 1921, p. 588].

Manning, An Appreciation of Cardinal [H. Lucas, S.J., in *Month*, April, 1921, p. 289].

Religious Experience: Its evolution in theory [H. Pinard in *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, Jan. 15, 1921, p. 63].

Retreats for Workers [E. Dulhoit in *Revue des Jeunes*, March 10, 1921, p. 364; C. Plater, S.J., in *Studies*, March, 1921, p. 97].

REVIEWS

I—THE CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE¹

THE recent destruction by fire of the shrine of Loreto reminds us of a book which, in the congestion entailed by modern press conditions, has too long remained unnoticed in these pages. More than a hundred years ago, in 1808, the oldest important sanctuary in Christendom was devastated by a similar conflagration. As it had previously been burnt down as early as the year 614, and as other demolitions seem to have taken place in 1008, and again in 1077, it will easily be understood that the historian of the Holy Sepulchre must necessarily find himself confronted by many architectural problems of extreme difficulty. So far as we can judge, Mr. George Jeffery, F.S.A., has executed his delicate task very skilfully. We may particularly commend the pains which he has taken to avail himself of all the sidelights which bear upon his subject. We gather that our author was the first to call attention to the fact that the ancient mosaic in the apse of the church of St. Pudenziana at Rome represents an attempt to depict the sacred buildings at Jerusalem as they existed in the earliest period of their history. Similarly he has taken full account of the Trivulzio ivory plaque and of the relatively modern discovery of the floor mosaic at Madeba, but most especially he devotes several pages, with some excellent illustrations, to the curiously interesting church of San Stefano at Bologna, where we know that St. Petronius deliberately set himself to erect what might be in some sort a counterpart of the Holy Places he had visited at Jerusalem. In these respects Mr. Jeffery's work represents a distinct advance upon the researches of such older authorities as de Vogüé and Clermont Ganneau. Further, the publication in comparatively recent times of the narratives of many early pilgrims has supplied another considerable mass of materials of which our author seems to have made good use. Perhaps something might also have been gleaned from that very useful work of Antonio de

¹ *A Brief Description of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem, and other Christian Churches in the Holy City.* By George Jeffery, F.S.A. Cambridge University Press. Pp. xii. 234. Price, 10s. 6d. 1919.

Aranda, in 1533, *Verdadera Informacion de la Tierra Santa*, but the bulk of this kind of literature is very vast, and in a work of small compass, such as that before us, the reader is already a little in danger of being bewildered by the multitude of facts and names which almost of necessity have to be thrown together without very much cohesion. What is certain is that Mr. Jeffery has provided an extremely useful guide-book of the most scientific kind, which no student, however learned in the subject, can afford to ignore. The illustrations are helpful and well executed, and we may note in conclusion that the author has not rigidly confined his researches to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre alone, but has also given some brief account of the other Christian churches and shrines in the holy city. The tone throughout is reverent and free from any trace of sectarian partizanship.

2—CATHOLIC PHILOSOPHY¹

WHEN a work has passed through twenty-three editions it would be rash for a reviewer to say that it did not meet a real need. On looking into this particular treatise, it is possible to detect points, both in its matter and arrangement, which account for its great success. Some of these are worth bringing out, as they might well be introduced into our own courses.

Père Lohr's *Cours* includes all the subjects which enter into the usual philosophy course, and, in addition, it gives in its final section a concise history of Philosophy. The space allotted to the different subjects is naturally unequal, by far the most extended treatment being accorded to Empirical Psychology; and this is one point to which we shall refer. But this does not mean that the others receive inadequate treatment. Keeping in mind that the intention is to supply students for the "Baccalauréat" (our Matriculation) with the matter they need, we find that more than ample information is given for the purpose. Moreover, it is set out with characteristic French clearness, and in a style which is rare in works of this kind. In spite of the condensed form in which the matter is presented, it makes most interesting reading. This is due in great part to the absence of dogmatism, and to a reasoned restraint of language, which is all the more

¹ *Cours de Philosophie*. By Père Ch. Lohr, S.J. 23rd Edit. 2 Vols. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne. Pp. xii. 754, 748. 1920.

effective because the author's judgments of value are quite unambiguously expressed.

The first point which has contributed to the success of the *Cours* is, we take it, the order of arrangement. Empirical Psychology comes first, and Logic takes second place, while Metaphysics is relegated to the second volume. It seems such an obvious advantage that Psychology should come before Logic, and above all, before Epistemology, that any other arrangement is almost incomprehensible. The young student, diving straight away into Theory of Knowledge and Metaphysics, cannot but be bewildered by the very wording of the problems he is asked to solve. The order Père Lohr adopts, as he tells us in his Preface, is that of the French Universities which he has in view.

Under the rubric Metaphysics the author includes the metaphysical portion of each particular science; Rational Psychology, Cosmology, Epistemology, and Ontology. Of course, Natural Theology, being all metaphysical, is relegated to a section of its own. This separation may have disadvantages from the pedagogical point of view, but it is in accord with modern Philosophy, and, on the whole, the advantages outweigh disadvantages.

The second point is the extended treatment of Empirical Psychology, called simply Psychology. The importance to-day of Psychology can scarcely be over-estimated, and above all, the necessity of taking into account the many investigations and discoveries made, and subjecting them to the sieve of careful discrimination. Every department of speculation and practice is to-day treated in terms of modern empirical psychology, and, in general, so interwoven with theories and fancies that it is difficult for the ordinary reader to distinguish observation from what Mr. Belloc has well termed "mood." Hence the importance of Catholics taking up this study and endowing it with the correct "mood," *i.e.*, basing it on right principles. It is useless to stand on one side and protest against extravagances; there is too much of real importance and utility in modern research work for us to neglect it, or even to leave it in others' hands.

Connected with this is the author's careful pruning of antiquated and obsolete learning. He plunges into modern questions with the modern perspective; not omitting sufficient indications about other matters of less immediate importance for the young aspirant to honours. Fundamental principles

are insisted on and proved, but shown in their immediate bearings on modern thought.

The "History of Philosophy" section enables him to extend his criticisms of particular theories by giving the more general reasons for or against a given thinker's philosophic standpoint. With an intelligent reader this will reinforce the discussion, necessarily brief, of those particular points.

Of course, the book is intended for the young student; still, it can be read with profit by the more advanced. It would be useless to enter here into criticism of details; on several matters there is plenty of room for difference of opinion. In the judgment of the present writer the author is excellent in his discussion of the so-called secondary qualities of matter; whereas he appears to be inconsistent in his treatment of logical truth.

3—IRELAND IN THE EUROPEAN SYSTEM¹

IN his first volume on this difficult topic Professor Hogan finds plenty of material to hand, but of a quality difficult to handle. The relations of Ireland to the European System must naturally be studied in the negotiations carried on by Irish exiles in foreign courts. Now exiles, much as we may sympathize with them, and compassionate their sufferings under tyranny and violence, should not (as experience teaches) be trusted without reserve, or followed to all lengths. But our Professor, with the warm Nationalism characteristic of his University town, gives us little help towards the necessary moderation.

In time the exiles would found Irish colleges and seminaries, which would train young Irishmen to keep their ancient Faith, and to preserve to Ireland what was noblest in her national ideals. But in the period under review all was dark, and the plans of the exiles, as so often happens, were so far too sanguine as to bring danger or harm on those whom they intended to help.

On the other hand, we are constantly confronted with ideals of absolutism, characteristic of that age, but which must seem quite strange to our generation. To the French of this period, as to the Spaniards of the next, it seemed the most natural thing in the world to talk of adding Ireland

¹ Vol. I, 1550—1557. By James Hogan, Professor of History, University College, Cork. London: Longmans. Pp. xxx. 237. 12s.

to the French, or to the Spanish Crown. The Irish exiles, in agony under insufferable misgovernment, might accept such theories as the only available promise of present relief. Our historian has to deal with several situations, which arose out of circumstances and ideas like these, and he treats them with the greatest frankness. But he gives us little assistance in making a balanced judgment on the course of events, and he often fairly puzzles us by commending in turn the insurgent exiles and such absolutists as Henri II. and Catherine de' Medici. France, which in chapter iii. is announced as the natural ally of the Catholics against the heretics, appears in chapter viii. as the natural ally of the heretics against the Catholics. Though we have no fault to find with the diligence of our author, we must clearly differ from several of his sweeping generalizations, based upon immature conclusions such as the above.

But when all this is said, it remains evident that this large-scale study of an important period in Irish history is a work of no small merit and importance. It affords light and guidance over a considerable field hitherto almost unsurveyed; and though not faultless, its blemishes will, we hope, sink out of sight as the work progresses.

4—VITALISM AND SCHOLASTICISM¹

SOME ten years ago Sir Bertram Windle published a book entitled *What is Life*, which has taken its place in Catholic literature in regard to what used, till quite recently, to be a hard-fought battle-field in the war between materialists and vitalists. The book before us now, *Vitalism and Scholasticism*, may be regarded as a second edition of that former treatise, but is also something distinct, in so far as the subject of life has been much written about and discussed during the interval, and many new treatises of authority have appeared which needed to be taken into account, as has been done in this new book, and likewise on the distinct ground that in the latter the author has ventured to raise the question whether the now general return to Vitalism is not in effect a return to all that is substantial in the traditional theory which used to be called Scholasticism.

The old scholastic theory of the constitution of bodies held that there were two fundamental principles inhering in all created things—a material principle which is alike in all,

¹ By Sir Bertram C. A. Windle. London and Edinburgh: Sands and Co. Pp. 256. Price, 8s. 6d. net.

and an immaterial principle of determination which imparts what is specific and determining to each class or species of material being. That the material principle was identical in all bodies was an inference from the observed fact that in all substantial changes the matter, though taking a new form when it derived its new determinations, seemed to retain what constituted it simply as matter. This theory, though it is called Scholastic because the great Schoolmen of the Catholic Church, in the mediæval period and since, took it up and developed it, owes its origin to the Greek philosopher, Aristotle. After being universally held during all those preceding centuries, it fell into disfavour when, in 1661, Richard Boyle, commonly called the Father of Chemistry, claimed to have established the existence of a certain limited number of elements, each indecomposable or incapable of being transmuted into anything but itself; while all other substances in the corporeal world were reducible to different combinations of these fixed elements. Lately, however, a new theory has come into favour suggested by the discovery of radium. This theory, says Sir Bertram Windle, teaches that within the atoms of which all chemical elements are made up are electrons or corpuscles of a certain kind, and that these corpuscles may be moving units of negative electricity, ensphered in an envelope of positive electricity; also the differences between the atoms of any two substances are in fact differences, not anything intrinsic in themselves, but of arrangement in the ether with which they are associated. This, indeed, cannot up to this be accepted as ascertained fact, but scientific opinion is tending to recognize it as such, and then the question cannot but suggest itself, is not this bringing us approximately to the old scholastic theory of *matter* and *form*. To harmonize the two systems it may be necessary, perhaps, to make some intrinsic modification of the old theory. As originally propounded, this system held that primordial matter, by simple union with the substantial forms, is "determined" to constitute the various different beings that are found in nature, but that this primordial matter is nowhere to be found existing of itself, apart from its inherent forms. Still the essential point in this ancient system is that it purported to describe the origin of substantial, not accidental, entities of plants and animals, not of artificially constructed implements or machines, and we should not be travelling beyond the

essentials of the scholastic theory, if in compliance with the exigencies of modern biology we had to admit that some of the ultimate elements out of which living beings are formed were capable of independent existence in themselves—for the composite entity into whose composition they entered would still be plainly recognizable as a natural, not a merely artificial combination. This, however, is a point which will be more certainly determined when this new conception of material particles, as yet still in its infancy, has been further studied.

But besides this episode bearing on the nature of Scholasticism, there is much that is new in the book to justify its other title of Vitalism. Though it may by now be considered proved that the vital processes, which had been so irrationally abandoned in favour of mechanism, have recovered, finally and unassailably, their claim to be vitalistic, there are still many points of detail, the vitalistic character of which is becoming established. And this new edition of Sir Bertram Windle's book investigates many of these. For instance, Professor Poynting, F.R.S., says of the purely verbal explanations which scientific men often put forward as if in themselves they amounted to a demonstration, that "a law of nature explains nothing; it is but a descriptive formula. There may be psychological and social generalizations which really tell us *why* this or that occurs, but chemical and physical generalizations are wholly concerned with the *how*." What we call laws of nature are based on our present experience, and the extension of that experience may lead to a change in the formularization of the law. This often misleads us as to what is meant by the law of conservation of energy. What is called catalysis is only beginning to be understood, and also the analogous action producing what are known as "hormones." Take, for instance, the pituitary body, which hangs like a small currant from the base of the brain and has such an influence on the stature of the possessor, making him to be a giant or a dwarf in proportion to its functional activity. Then there are the adrenals, and the vitamins, of such vital importance in the prevention of scurvy. It is interesting to learn from the book before us that that grievous disorder of the nerves known as "beri-beri" is mainly due to the "polishing" of rice, which removes a vitamine essential to the health of those races with whom rice is a principal article of diet.

Considering his fuller treatment of these and similar points, one feels that Sir Bertram Windle has greatly enhanced the value of his former book.

5—GREEK COMPOSITION¹

THOSE who have at heart the maintenance of Greek in our schools will rejoice at the appearance of a new handbook on Greek composition. Such an event at the present time is almost a phenomenon, in view of the difficulties which now beset the path of the publisher; and it seems to afford some comfort to the ever diminishing class of old-fashioned folk who refuse to part with the idea that the disappearance of Greek from our schools would be disastrous to true education. The battle cannot be lost as long as it is considered worth while to bring out such a book as that which Father Donovan has just composed.

Readers of the *Classical Review*, with memories that extend over several decades, will not be surprised at the appearance of this digest of Greek idioms, the fruit of many years discerning study of the great Greek writers. Perhaps their surprise has rather been that hitherto the author has been content with contributions to periodical literature. Many years' experience on the teaching staff of a great college is a guarantee that Father Donovan is not out to meet imaginary needs, or to meet them in a way that is not commended by the test of actual teaching. The purpose of the book is to provide help in the difficult task of translating English prose into idiomatic classical Greek. The plan followed is based on the principle—which no one with any experience of teaching will question—that the concrete is more helpful than the abstract. Hence, rules and abstract theory are given as briefly as is possible, but are illustrated by copious examples. These illustrative sentences, in many of which the practised eye will recognize the hand of Demosthenes, Thucydides, or some other master of Greek style, occupy by far the greater bulk of the book. As the title indicates, this first Part is mainly devoted to what the author more simply calls elsewhere the "syntax and idiom of the Greek subordinate clause." Although in his summaries and

¹ *Theory of Advanced Greek Prose Composition with Digest of Greek Idioms. Part I.: Syntax and Idiom of the Subordinate Clause, Functions and Equivalents of the Parts of Speech.* By John Donovan, S.J., M.A. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Pp. 124. Price, 5s. net.

sub-headings the language is sometimes that of the grammarian pure and simple, there is no obscurity in the short paragraphs explanatory of the different clauses and their usages.

A defect that used to be noticeable in a particular class of schoolbook was a certain one-sidedness that sacrificed education to instruction, and in the pursuit of one branch of knowledge, quite neglected, and was even positively harmful to, the cultivation of some other. English, strange to say, was the subject that suffered most in this way, passages set for translation or translated into English, being often expressed in the baldest language, in no way calculated to form in the pupil a sense of what is pure, correct, and harmonious in his own tongue. Father Donovan's book in this respect is a model; and will train the student in the use of English, as well as teach the theory and practice of Greek composition. His book helps one to realize, perhaps unconsciously, the flexibility and richness of our language, and to take a pride, while translating from any foreign tongue, in the discovery and use of just those expressions that will convey the sense of the original in idiomatic and rhythmical English. Every illustrative sentence is given in English as well as Greek.

The printers have done their work admirably; a slip even in the Greek accents is very hard to find. The paper is good and the type excellent. Our only criticism is that there is not an adequate table of contents.

6—ST. AUGUSTINE A PAPIST¹

THESE two volumes well sustain Mgr. Batiffol's reputation. In them we have a handy and judicious history both of Donatism and Pelagianism; of Manicheism less is said. St. Augustine's idea of the Church, the *Catholica*, and his devotion to the Apostolic See, *Cathedra Petri*, are set forth at length; how enthusiastic he was for the one, how loyal to the other. The affair of Apiarius is correctly told, also the prohibition of juridical appeals to Rome by the Council of Carthage, A.D. 426: we have the signatures to it of fifteen bishops, but *not* of Bishop Augustine. The ebullition was like that concerning our statutes of *præmunire* before the days of Henry VIII., a flash in the pan, void of

¹ *Le Catholicisme de Saint Augustin*. By Pierre Batiffol. 2 Vols. Paris: Gabalda. Pp. viii. 276; iv. 278. Price, 14.00 fr.

action, a good grumble in fact, for which perhaps there was some provocation. Of predestination the author writes cautiously. "Not every truth is life," he says, "and predestination is a truth of this order." He rightly sets aside as a mere piece of fatalism Harnack's contention that predestination annuls the value of the Church and Sacraments as channels of salvation. Whoever is predestined to the end, is predestined also to the means. The work concludes with a just estimate of the dogmatic value of St. Augustine's teachings as a Doctor of the Church. Altogether a good theological biography of the great Bishop of Hippo.

SHORT NOTICES

BIBLICAL.

BESIDES the learned quarterly, *Biblica*, which we are pleased to behold in vigorous and valuable life, and also *Orientalia*, an Oriental review of more irregular habits, the Biblical Institute at Rome has now begun to issue *Verbum Domini*, a monthly periodical for the use of all priests, and written exclusively in Latin. The relation of this latter to *Biblica* is happily put in the explanation that it is the function of *Biblica* to investigate biblical questions, of *Verbum Domini* to publish the results of investigation. The monthly periodical consists of short articles upon clearly defined topics, such as naturally tempt to perusal. Each number consists of 32 pages; the price outside Italy is 26 francs, which at the present rate of exchange is as cheap as one could wish. The motto chosen for it is from St. Jerome, "Ignorance of the Scriptures is ignorance of Christ": words quoted in the *Providentissimus Deus* of Pope Leo XIII. and again in *Spiritus Paraclitus*, the encyclical upon St. Jerome lately issued by the present Holy Father. Passages from this latter open the first number, indicating the manifold use of the Holy Writ, to feed the soul in her spiritual life, to explain and defend the Catholic Faith, to equip preacher and teacher. We wish the new monthly a long and fruitful career. It is published from the Biblical Institute itself (Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Piazza della Pilotta 35, Roma, 1).

While on the subject of matters biblical, we may mention that we have been informed by the publishers of Dr. Vogels' *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Schwann of Düsseldorf), noticed in our November number, that it may be bought from England without increase, so that at present the price would be about a florin.

APOLOGETIC.

The "Outline of History" which some six months ago proceeded from the lively brain and picturesque pen of Mr. H. G. Wells, has continued during that interval to lead thousands of readers into error or to perpetuate the false impressions they already possessed. It has done something also to puzzle ill-instructed Catholics, for its confident dogmatism on matters of science aims directly at Catholic tradition, and the book is to be found in use even in Catholic schools. None of our able scholars or writers has as yet thought fit to put forth an adequate

reply, although the book has been severely criticized in this and in other periodicals. It may be that the answer, to be exhaustive, would make a much bigger volume than that of Mr. Wells, and our writers are scared at the magnitude of the task. In the meantime, pending the appearance of a Catholic "Outline of History" compiled by such writers as Canon Barry, Professor Windle, and Mr. Belloc, we welcome the appearance from our own pages, in a neat shilling volume, of Dr. Downey's *Some Errors of H. G. Wells: a Catholic Criticism of the "Outline of History"* (B.O. and W.: 2s., bound), which should do much to discredit the showy sciolism of our scientific romancer. For Dr. Downey's criticism, as our readers know, for the most part takes the deadly form of showing that Mr. Wells, confessedly not an expert, has been badly briefed in his subject and has embraced theories and advanced hypotheses which have been already given up by the rationalist school to which he belongs. This cogent exposure should be in the hands of every educated Catholic eager in the defence of the Faith, and pass from those hands into the hands of many inquirers eager for the acquisition of truth.

DEVOTIONAL.

The second volume of *St. Bernard's Sermons on the Canticle of Canticles* (Browne and Nolan: 10s.), translated by a Priest of Mount Melleray, has followed on the first, which we noticed in October last, with commendable promptitude. We have now the complete set of the Saint's sermons on this topic, which yet, as we have said, deal with only about a fourth of it, and are a fine monument to his eloquence and piety. The translation is smooth and accurate, and has a due equipment of explanatory notes.

The supernatural life which the true Christian, redeemed and made a child of God, should lead here below is developed in a series of devotional essays by a well-known French writer, the Abbé Sertillanges, in *La Vie Catholique* (Gabalda: 8.00 fr. net). The source of that life is, of course, our Lord, and in Him we find, what is the whole art of living well, the rules of determining the due subordination of the temporal to the eternal. Abbé Sertillanges discusses the application of Christ's principles to the various kinds and aspects of human existence with characteristic freshness and eloquence.

If eternal life is to know "Him whom Thou hast sent," and if, as St. Jerome says, not to know the Scriptures is to ignore Christ, it follows that the series of short meditations on the Gospels, which M. Y. D'Isné calls *Allons à Dieu* (Lethielleux: 8.00 fr.), adapted specially for the young, should be a valuable aid to salvation. For real fruitful knowledge of the Gospels can only be obtained by meditation on them, and that kind of prayerful study cannot begin too early.

The eloquent Dominican, Père Janvier, has delivered the Lenten Conferences from the famous pulpit of Notre Dame every year without a break from 1903. During the war he was preaching on Charity and Prudence and Justice. Since the Armistice he has been occupied, fitly enough, with Religion (justice towards God), Fortitude, and Temperance, virtues never more needed in public life than at present. The sermons for 1920 under review developed *La Vertu de Force* (Lethielleux: 8.00 fr.). Fortitude in all its manifestations and the vices which directly oppose it. They form an able exposition and defence of the

reasonableness as well as of the beauty and grandeur of Christian virtue.

It is an axiom of the spiritual life that human perfection is not to be found in independence which can only be partial and illusory, but in conscious and voluntary submission of the will to the proper authority. This axiom is expanded in a series of considerations addressed to young girls which Canon Cordonnier has published under the title *Dans la Silence et dans la Prière* (Lethielleux: 4.00 fr.), wherein he shows how in exact imitation of our Lord perfection of the will may be indefinitely cultivated.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

No sight was more familiar to the British armies in France than the tower of the great church of Albert with its statue of the Madonna and Child stretching out without falling at right angles from the top, owing to the impact of a German shell. The builder of that great church, who raised four million francs to pay for it in five years, is commemorated in *Mgr. Godin, Doyen d'Albert* (Lethielleux: 7.50 fr.), the first volume of a biography written by M. Henri Merlier, who describes in a charming Introduction how he came to undertake the work. Mgr. Godin died the year before the war and was spared the sorrow of seeing the ruin of what was a large part of his life-work, but, as his biographer gives us to understand, there was a far larger part still, his work for souls, which no engines of destruction could bring to naught.

Dr. Charles H. Robinson has edited a *Life of Otto, Apostle of Pomerania*, drawn from two more or less contemporary biographies by Ebo and Herbordus. The Saint, who was Bishop of Bamberg, in Bavaria, lived from 1060 to 1139, and began his missionary labours about 1120 amongst a practically pagan people, who had this much to excuse them, that they had been repeatedly conquered by the rulers of Poland and forced to accept Christianity. The narrative which Dr. Robinson has translated and supplied with all necessary critical apparatus gives a very vivid picture of that wild land on the south coast of the Baltic and its savage inhabitants. (S.P.C.K.: 8s. 6d. net.)

The cloistered career of a holy Visitation Nun has been published for the edification of the faithful in the *Vie de la Mère Marie-Madeleine Ponnet* (Téqui: 6.00 fr.), a biography expanded from the usual short notice furnished to the Order of its deceased members. The exceptional piety of this saintly religious, which was distinguished by a loving simplicity, led to the demand for a fuller Life which will serve to animate other Christian souls to realize the possibilities of their faith. Mère Ponnet died in 1913 at the age of 55.

Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C., has taken advantage of the continued demand for his popular *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* (Longmans: 12s. 6d. net) to correct in the third edition, in the light of fuller information, some errors that had appeared in the original text, but the substance of the book remains unchanged, and it forms the best short account of the great Saint that we have in the language. How St. Francis would deal with the modern worship of Mammon which is the chief cause of our continued unrest may be gathered from this able exposition of the true Franciscan spirit of detachment.

POETRY.

Huysmans in his book *Les Foules de Lourdes* has written with the unsparing pencil of Hogarth, but Father John Fitzpatrick sings his

Song of Lourdes (B.O. and W.: 5s. net) from the choir school of the Oblates of Mary Immaculate. Huysmans has taken upon himself the thankless task of Devil's Advocate; Father Fitzpatrick has revelled in writing from the side of the angels. If you are a realist, with the belief that the banner of Lourdes is a blood-stained bandage surmounted by a crown of thorns tricked out in tinsel, you will possibly find this ballad too pretty for your taste, too unweeded of wild flowers, and redolent rather of fresh air than of guttering candles; but if you are an idealist, loyal to a sky-blue flag with rampant golden roses, you will delight in every verse of it, and drink in its crystal clearness to settle Huysmans' August dust in your memory. Nor yet will you take harm of it in your all-important literary taste, however delicate that may be, for only the poetaster will discover the few faults of style, hidden as they are under the shadow of Mary's rock in this weary land. Any poet can make his biceps swell through his work: that is a mere matter of training. But one must write at Mary's knee before one's poems take the sweet of her, to leave it lingering in their readers' minds.

NON-CATHOLIC WORKS.

Despite a distinctly Protestant view of the history and character of the Church, and a woeful if complacent ignorance of the Society of Jesus in particular, natural enough in the Succentor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, Mr. E. H. J. Campbell's **Christianity and International Morality** (Heffer: 3s. net) develops a sound proposition in declaring that the State is not above morality, and that the principle of nationality should be regulated and checked by the higher principle of human brotherhood. But his misreading of history prevents him from seeing that unless this latter principle is embodied in a united and universal Church it can never be fully operative. And his misreading of history is not confined to the past. A writer who can assert that "Britain has emerged from this war higher and nobler than ever in the eyes of Europe" (p. 66), has evidently read to little purpose the contemporary European press.

The Rev. P. T. C. Crick, bishop-elect of Rockhampton, who was an Anglican chaplain during the war, has had brought home to him in various ways the astonishing lack of discipline in that communion, and embodies in **The Voice of the Layman, and the Church of the Future** (Heffer: 3s. net) his diagnosis of the disease and his suggestions as to a remedy. There is nothing very acute in the analysis, nothing very drastic in the solution: the impression is left of a good, sincere man, puzzled and distressed by the confusion around him, and yet hoping that things will improve in course of time, if only the "Church" does her duty.

The little essay called **The Last Supper: its significance in the Upper Room** (Heffer: 2s. net), by R. H. Kennett, D.D., is a Protestant exercise in private judgment, paying no heed to tradition or to the authorized interpretation of the Scriptures by the Catholic Church. It is a conclusive illustration of the ineffectiveness of the Bible alone as the Rule of Faith.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The "Voyageurs" whose proceedings are chronicled in the handsome illustrated volume compiled and edited by Father E. Lecompte, S.J., and called **Nos Voyageurs** ("La Vie Nouvelle," Montreal: \$1.25), are not the picturesque figures who appear in Fenimore Cooper's works

but a Canadian association of modern Catholic business men whose service of Mammon is guided and conditioned by their service of God. Père Lecompte's narrative of their social and religious activities is very inspiring as evidence of how commerce can be permeated by religion, and unity of material aim made productive of spiritual advantage. The ideal is, of course, practically the same as that set before such similar organizations, as the Knights of Columbus and the Catenians, members of which may draw help and inspiration from this record.

Between the Belgian Congo and the north-east shore of the Victoria Nyanza, right on the Equator, lies the tropical province of Uganda, lately brought prominently before the notice of the Catholic world by the beatification of its first martyrs. A valuable contribution to the ethnography and geography of this district has been made by the publication of *Entre le Victoria, l'Albert et l'Edouard* (Procure des Pères Blancs, Marseilles: 13.50 fr.), a finely illustrated volume by Father Julien Gorjer, himself one of the White Fathers. It forms a complete study of the Uganda Protectorate, geographical, racial, religious, and social, by one who has lived and laboured there for long years, and is thoroughly conversant with all he describes. The plates which adorn the volume represent a great variety of human types and many charming scenes.

We should imagine that the general public in this generation have had enough of war practice to lose interest in war theory, and that therefore a highly-specialized treatise like *The Art of War in Italy: 1494—1529* (Cambridge University Press: 12s. 6d. net), by F. L. Taylor, M.A., M.C., would appeal mainly to professional soldiers. Yet the student of manners and politics will find much to interest him in this learned study in the evolution of weapons and armies. He will learn to appreciate the essential barbarism of war as an instrument of policy, and the age-long folly of mankind which has prevented the elaboration of an effective substitute for this rough, uncertain, and destructive means of justice. And these scholarly pages will teach him to deplore the enormous waste of human lives and material resources, the constant offence to civilization and debasement of the moral standard that have resulted from cultivating the art of war.

A noted French social writer, M. A. Lukan, is developing in a series of little volumes a subject already dealt with more summarily by the Abbé Garriguet in his *Social Value of the Gospel*, a subject of supreme importance in these days when the working world is called upon to admire and follow other ideals of social welfare than those taught by Christianity. The series, some numbers of which have already appeared in another form, is called "L'Enseignement Social de Jésus," and the volume under notice, No. VI., *La Loi Social du Travail* (Procure Générale, Paris: 3.00 fr.), discusses the attitude of our Lord towards labour and the workers. He is widely read in his subject, and quotes from many authors in support of or in opposition to his deductions. The series when concluded will be a valuable addition to Christian Apologetic.

Our European preoccupations during the past eight or nine years have prevented most of us from following the fortunes of China, which became a Republic in 1912, but which has not yet succeeded in stabilizing its Government. The reissue in a third revised edition of Dr. Hosea B. Morse's *The Trade and Administration of China* (Longmans: 25s. net),

first published in 1908, comes opportunely to provide a handy means of gaining knowledge of the present state of the vast Republic and the various stages it has traversed in its recent development. Dr. Morse, who was connected with the Chinese Customs for over thirty years, writes from an intimate knowledge of the subject and, withal, with a certain literary grace and touch of humour which renders a work dealing necessarily with statistics eminently readable.

The well-known Jesuit establishment in Bombay, St. Xavier's College and High School, celebrated its fiftieth anniversary in 1919, and signalled the occasion by a well-documented and illustrated record called a *Jubilée Souvenir*. It forms a complete history of the institution and of its changing *personnel* from the start, and duly chronicles the celebration of the great event. Owing to the war the College is no longer under the charge of the German Province of the Society: their successors have a lofty ideal of hard and successful work set before them in this volume.

A very touching record, eloquent alike of true patriotism and of the spirit of religious sacrifice, has been compiled by the diligence of Père A. Brou and others in the volume *Les Jésuites morts pour la France, 1914-1919* (Mame et Fils, Tours) which gives a brief account of the 214 members of the Society on the side of the Allies who, either as chaplains, stretcher-bearers, or combatants, met their deaths in the great war. The vast majority, of course, belonged to the French Province, of which from first to last over 900 members were engaged, but the list includes amongst them the British, Belgians, and Italians who perished on the Western area. Many of them won military distinctions. The accounts vary in length from a few lines to several pages. We trust that the Republic will show her gratitude towards those who died in her defence by respecting henceforth the religious liberty of their brethren, who have no other wish than to labour for her true welfare. This volume will have permanent value as a signal refutation of the calumnies of anti-clericalism.

The long-expected *Jesuit Directory* for 1921 (O'Sullivan: 1s. net), advertised in our February issue has at last appeared. Its 161 pages contain a vast amount of interesting information concerning the English Province of the Society and its activities at home and abroad. Those who regard the Jesuits as a secret society will be amazed at the candour with which their doings are divulged in this record. It includes, besides the "Jesuit Calendar," which is enriched with a variety of biographical and historical details concerning past members, and a striking panegyric on St. Ignatius and his Company by Mgr. Howlett of Westminster, a detailed account of each several establishment, both in this country and on the foreign missions, with their staffs and activities, parochial, social and educational, brief statistics of other English-speaking provinces, a complete list of addresses of the members of the English Province, statistical tables of the whole Order, divided into provinces, etc., etc. A slight lack of clearness in the arrangement of the matter—for instance, there are no page headings—as well as certain typographical inexactitudes, is perhaps to be put down to the fact that this is a pioneer work with no tradition to follow, and that it had to be produced at very short notice. The editor promises amendment next year, but meanwhile he is to be warmly congratulated on the conspicuous success of his first attempt.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The Guide to the Mass (B.O. and W.: 6d.) which Mr. H. F. Vaughan has compiled for the use of non-Catholics briefly explains for the observer the significance of the acts and words of the Celebrant at Low Mass, Missa Cantata and High Mass. It should be very useful for those for whom it is intended, but the more so if the page-headings were to indicate what form of the Mass is described below.

The C.T.S. publishes at 2d. the argument founded on the Epistle to the Galatians, whereby the Rev. T. J. Agius, S.J., established in our pages last November St. Paul's adherence to the principle of the Papacy, under the telling title, **St. Paul a Papist "by Revelation."**

At the age of 71, after a Catholic life of nearly fifty years and in the forty-fourth year of his priesthood, the Rev. Henry H. Wyman, C.S.P., has written a pamphlet called **The Story of my Religious Experiences** (Paulist Press: 5 cents), tracing for the benefit of other inquirers the steps by which he was led from the Congregational to the Catholic Church, one of those infinitely varied routes to the same happy goal.

The three numbers of the **Catholic Mind** (America Press: 5 cents each) for January 22nd, February 8th, and February 22nd contain amongst other excellent reading matter, a statement of the functions of *Religion in Social Service*, by Right Rev. W. Turner, DD.; a sketch of the *Church in the United States*; the Pope's Encyclical on behalf of Starving Children; a brief account of the *Sisters of Charity*, by T. F. Burke, C.S.P.; and the declaration of the Holy See concerning the proselytizing activities of various Protestant Associations, notably the Y.M.C.A.

The recent experiences of the University of Louvain have been the most disastrous in its history, but its staunch Catholicism has always exposed it to persecution. What it endured as a consequence of the Reformation is told by one of its present Professors, M. Leon van der Essen, in a plentifully documented sketch called *Les Tribulations de l'Université de Louvain pendant le dernier quart du XVI^e siècle*. But, like the Church it champions, it rises again, ever young and vigorous, as it is now in process of doing after the worst blow of all. (Dewit, Brussels.)

Introduced by two Cardinals, the Rev. Joseph Sunn's booklet, **In Touch with God** (B.O. and W.: 1s. net), hardly needs further commendation. It is a series of practical hints on the manner of praying and meditating successfully and of practising the presence of God.

Those who have to do with church choirs will find **The Catholic Choirmaster**, a magazine published quarterly at 25 cents by the Society of St. Gregory of America, a very helpful production. The October number contains as a supplement twelve *Tantum Ergos* by Caspar Ette and a section of the "white list" of church music approved by the Society.

A similar list, called **Catholic Church Music**, is issued by the firm of J. and M. Chester, Ltd., of London, with an introduction by Mr. R. Terry.

From Messrs. Browne and Nolan, Dublin, comes **The Gregorian Melodies** (Vatican Edition) of the Office, Mass, Burial of the Dead, and Benediction, in Tonic Sol-Fa Notation, arranged by the Very Rev. D. J. O'Doherty. Price one shilling.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

AMERICA PRESS, New York.

The Catholic Mind. Vol. XIX. No. 4.

BEAUCHESNE, Paris.

Critique et Contrôle Médical des Guérisons Surnaturelles. By Dr. Le Bec. Pp. 264.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.

The Song of Lourdes. By the Rev. John Fitzpatrick. Pp. xi. 202. Price, 5s. net. *Henry Edward Manning: His Life and Labours*. By Shane Leslie. Pp. 504. Price, 25s. *Some Errors of H. G. Wells*. By Richard Downey, D.D. Pp. v. 57. Price, 1s. net. *In Touch with God*. By Rev. J. Sunn. Pp. 57. Price, 1s. net. *A Guide to the Mass*. By H. F. Vaughan. Pp. 37. Price, 6d.

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, London.
Several Twopenny Pamphlets.

DEWIT, Brussels.

Les Tribulations de l'Université de Louvain. By L. Van der Essen. Pp. 26.

HEFFER, Cambridge.

The Last Supper. By R. H. Kennett, D.D. Pp. 49. Price, 2s. net.

HERDER, London.

Synopsis Theologia Dogmatica Specialis. By Dr. A. Sanda. Vol. I. Pp. xxiv. 384. Price, 5s. *Conspectus Codicis Juris Canonici*. By J. Laurentius, S.J. Pp. xvi. 125. Price, 4s. 6d. *Demonstratio Apostolicae Prædicationis (St. Irenæus)*. Translated and Edited by Dr. S. Weber. Pp. viii. 124. Price, 3s. *Reuter's Neo-Confessaricus*. 3rd Edition. By J. B. Umberg, S.J. Pp. xi. 469. Price, 10s. 6d. *Petrus Canisius*. By O. Braunsberger. Pp. xi. 333. Price, 14 m. *Grundsätzliches sur Charakteristik der neueren und neuesten Scholastik*. By F. Ehrle, S.J. Pp. 32. *Liber Genesis*. Edited by Dr. S. Hoberg.

LETHIELLEUX, Paris.

La Morale Chrétienne. By Abbé Toublan. Pp. 227. Price, 5.00 fr. *La Vierge toute belle*. By E. Roupain, S.J. Pp. 408. Price, 12.00 fr. *Lieut. G. de Montferrand*. By Abbé L. Rouzic. Pp. vi. 278. Price, 7.00 fr. *Les Idées Pédagogiques de S. Pierre Fourier*. By J. Renault. Pp. 106. Price, 2.00 fr. *Les Idées Pédagogiques de la B. Julie Billiart*. By Marie Halcant. Pp. 66. Price, 1.80 fr. *Les Jésuites dans l'Algérie*. By Père L. Charles. Pp. 136. Price, 3.00 fr.

LONGMANS, London.

A Selection from the Poems of Carducci. By E. A. Tribe. Pp. lxxxii. 154. Price, 14s. net. *Life of St. Francis of Assisi*. By Father Cuthbert, O.S.F.C. 3rd Edition. Pp. xv. 536. Price, 12s. 6d. net. *The Trade and Administration of China*. By H. B. Morse. 3rd Edit. Pp. xv. 505. Price, 25s. net.

PAULIST PRESS, New York.

The Story of my Religious Experiences. By Rev. H. H. Wyman, C.S.P. Price, \$4.00 per 100.

PERRIN & Co., Paris.

La Loi de la Vie. By A. Eymieu. Pp. 330. Price, 7.00 fr.

RAUCH, Innsbruck.

De Poenis Ecclesiasticis. By H. Noldin. S.J. Pp. 120. *Repetitorium Theologiae Fundamentalis*. By P. V. Wass, O.M.Cap. Pp. 328. Price, 15.00 fr. *Epitome Theologiae Moralis*. By C. Telch. Pp. xlii. 602. Price, 20.00 fr.

S.P.C.K., London.

Dictionary of the Vulgate New Testament. By J. M. Harden, D.D. Pp. 126. Price, 4s. net. *Philosophumena*. Edited by J. Legge. 2 Vols. Pp. vi. 180; vi. 189. Price, 30s. net. *Demonstratio Evangelica*. Edited by W. J. Ferrar, 2 Vols. Pp. xl. 271; 257. Price, 30s. net.

TÉQUI, Paris.

Vie de la Mère Ponnnet. Pp. xiv. 338. Price, 6.00 fr. *Les Reconstructions nécessaires*. By Mgr. Gibier. Pp. xxii. 352. Price, 6.00 fr. *Le Mystère de l'Eglise*. By Père H. Clérissac, O.P. 2nd Edit. Pp. xxii. 366. Price, 6.00 fr. *Journal d'un Converti*. By P. Van der Meer de Walcheren. 2nd Edit. Pp. xvi. 285. Price, 5.00 fr.

THE VINE PRESS, Steyning.

Swift Wings: Songs in Sussex. Pp. 59. Price, 6s. net.

TIMES PRESS, Bombay.

Jubilée Souvenir of St. Xavier's. Illustrated. Pp. 275.

"VITA E PENSIERO," Milan.

La Fiorita Franciscana. I. La Prosa: Edited by Tommaso Nediani. Pp. xxii. 490. Price, 18.00 lire. *Uomini Piccoli o Uomini Grandi*. By Francesco Olgiati. Pp. 304. Price, 8.00 lire.

